TABLE OF CONTENTS.

No.	No. and Name	Date.	Subject.	Page.
1	Mr. Morgan (Angora) No. 437	1931 Dec. 27	Heads of missions in Turkey. Transmits report for 1931	1
2	Mr. Morgan No. 445	„ 30	Perso-Turkish relations. Reports arrangements for Minister for Foreign Affairs' journey to Tehran and conversation with Iraqi Prime Minister regarding Perso-Turkish relations	6
3	Mr. Morgan No. 446	„ 30	Turkish Cabinet. Reports and comments on creation of Ministries of Agriculture and of Customs and Monopolies and gives records of the new Ministers	7
4	Mr. Morgan No. 447	„ 30	Iraqi-Persian relations. Reports arrival of Iraqi Prime Minister and on progress of negotiations. Draws attention to attitude of Turkish Government towards the Assyrians	8
5	To Sir G. Clerk (Constantinople) No. 11	1932 Jan. 8	Iraqi-Turkish relations. Information given by Turkish Ambassador regarding forthcoming visit of Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs to Tehran to negotiate a modification of the frontier which would leave the whole of Mount Ararat in Turkey	8
6	Sir G. Clerk No. 1 Saving. Tel.	„ 11	Iraqi-Turkish relations. Reports signature of Residence Convention and Treaties of Commerce and Extradition	9
7	Sir G. Clerk No. 8	„ 6	Italo-Turkish relations. Reports signature of agreement defining maritime frontier between Turkey and Italy and settling ownership of islands and islets off south-west coast of Turkey	9
8	Sir G. Clerk No. 9. Conf.	„ 6	Perso-Turkish relations. Conversation with Minister for Foreign Affairs regarding latter's visit to Tehran; objects of visit and motives of Turkey in desiring to secure a modification and settlement of the frontier	9
9	Sir G. Clerk No. 13	„ 6	Syrian Throne. Conversation with Minister for Foreign Affairs, who considers King Feisal's candidature to be dead. Turkey would prefer to see Syria a republic, but would have no objection to candidature of Abbas Hilmi Pasha and had so informed King Faisal	10
10	Sir G. Clerk No. 15	„ 8	Iraqi-Turkish relations. Refers to No. 1. Reports further on negotiations and on matters discussed	11
11	Sir G. Clerk No. 17	„ 8	Syria-Turkish relations. Information from Nuri Pasha regarding Turkish interest in Syrian affairs. Turks still hope to secure cession of Alexandretta and dislike insistence of Lebanese State	11
12	To Sir G. Clerk No. 42	1932 Jan. 28	Perso-Turkish relations. Turkish Ambassador's information that frontier treaty had been signed at Tehran on 23rd January. It provides for the inclusion of the whole of Mount Ararat in Turkey	12
13	To Sir G. Clerk No. 21. Conf.	„ 14	Turkish personalities. Transmits complete revised report on	12
14	To Sir G. Clerk No. 27. Conf.	„ 18	Iraqi-Turkish relations. Refers to No. 6. Transmits text of Iraqi-Turkish Commercial Treaty of the 10th January, 1932, and informs of substance of various letters exchanged	43
15	To Sir G. Clerk No. 28. Conf.	„ 18	Iraqi-Turkish relations. Refers to No. 6. Transmits text of, and comments on, Extradition Treaty signed on the 9th January, 1932	45
16	Sir G. Clerk No. 29. Conf.	„ 18	Iraqi-Turkish relations. Refers to No. 6. Transmits text of, and comments on, Residence Convention signed on the 9th January, 1932	50
17	Sir G. Clerk No. 30. Conf.	„ 18	Iraqi-Turkish relations. Refers to No. 6. Information given by Nuri Pasha regarding situation reached in discussions on frontier, brigandage, grazing, the Sheikh of Barzan, Assyrians and Turkish share of oil royalties	52
18	Sir G. Clerk No. 35	„ 22	Smuggling on Turkish frontiers. Refers to Part XXII, No. 53. Reports substance of three laws designed to deal with the contraband traffic. Creation of post of General Commandant for Customs Defence	52
19	Mr. Henderson (Tehran) No. 45	„ 27	Perso-Turkish relations. Refers to No. 8. Reports on successful visit of Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs to Tehran and translates communiqué summarising results of discussions	53
20	Sir G. Clerk No. 53	Feb. 5	Koran in Turkish. Reports on reading of Turkish Koran in various mosques. Press comment has been favourable. Discusses motives of Turkish Government in favouring the innovation	55
21	Department of Overseas Trade	„ 18	Turkish financial situation. Transmits Angora despatch O.T. (A) 4 reporting failure of Turkish Government to meet its engagements with Messrs. Vickers and discussing possibility of Turkey negotiating a foreign loan	55
22	Sir G. Clerk No. 60	„ 12	Religion in Turkey. Refers to No. 20. Transmits memorandum by Mr. Brunwell on scene at St. Sophia during celebration of Night of Power. Irreverence and disorders suggest that official innovations are designed rather to break up old religious traditions than to inculcate piety	57
23	Sir G. Clerk No. 63	„ 15	Perso-Turkish relations. Refers to No. 8. Persian Ambassador's statement that details of frontier rectification had been quickly settled. The Turks rejected a proposal to divert the Trebizond-Maku road to pass through Bezirgan	58

No. and Name.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
24 Mr. Morgan ... **No. 88**	1932 Mar. 1	Travel to and in Turkey ... Refers to Part XXII, No. 39. Reports new regulations permitting greater freedom of travel for non-Moslems and fugitive Turks	58
25 Department of Overseas Trade	„ 11	Turkish financial situation ... Refers to No. 21. Transmits Angora despatch O.T. (A) 5 reporting Turkish proposal to foreign armament firms for postponement of payments. This action confirms Turkey's need for money	59
26 Colonial Office ...	„ 21	Iraqi-Turkish relations ... Secret letter from Iraqi Council of Ministers to High Commissioner, Baghdad, enclosing copies of letters exchanged between Iraqi Prime Minister and Turkish Government at close of treaty negotiations	60
27 Mr. Morgan **No. 101**	„ 18	Iraqi-Turkish relations ... Reports presentation of credentials by the Emir Zeid, the new Iraqi Minister. The new Minister's statement to the press regarding British mandate in Iraq and question of Syrian throne	64
28 Mr. Morgan **No. 102**	„ 17	Affairs of the Smyrna Quay Company ... Transmits and comments on Smyrna despatch reporting seizure of company by Turkish authorities on grounds of fraudulent and corrupt conduct of its affairs	65
29 Mr. Waterlow (Sofia) **No. 62**	„ 17	Bulgaro-Turkish relations ... Reports on two days' visit of Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs to Sofia and substance of conversation with him. Tevfik Rusto Bey anxious to bring about a Bulgaro-Greco-Turkish understanding. His dislike of French policy	67
30 Sir R. Maconachie (Kabul) **No. 39. Conf.**	„ 10	Anglo-Turkish relations ... Reports Minister for Foreign Affairs' enquiry as to state of relations and his view that both Afghanistan and Turkey would do well to cultivate close relations with His Majesty's Government. His opinion that Turkey would welcome any encouragement from His Majesty's Government	70
31 Mr. Morgan **No. 117**	„ 31	Communism in Turkey ... Reports on arrests of Communists in Constantinople, Adrianople, Brussa and Samsun	71
32 Mr. Morgan **No. 124**	Apr. 1	Straits Commission ... Transmits commission's report for 1931	71
33 Sir R. Graham (Rome) **No. 274**	„ 8	Italo-Turkish relations ... Refers to No. 7. Reports Minister for Foreign Affairs' speech at presentation to Fascist Grand Council of Italo-Turkish agreement defining status of Castelrosso islets and delimiting Italo-Turkish territorial waters	72
34 Sir G. Clerk **No. 127**	„ 11	Turkish financial situation ... Discusses situation as a result of Turkey's postponement of payment on foreign contracts and prospects of Government weathering the economic crisis	73

No. and Name.	Date.	Subject.	Page.
35 Sir G. Clerk ... **No. 136**	1932 Apr. 13	Turkish financial situation ... Refers to Part XXII, No. 7. Reports anticipated budget deficit and steps taken to meet it, as well as proposals for balancing budget for 1932–33	75
36 Mr. Hoare ... **No. 165. Secret**	„ 5	Perso-Turkish relations ... Transmits Tabriz despatch reporting arrangements for delimitation of frontier and dealing with frontier situation. Perso-Turkish agreements have passed first reading in Majlis	76
37 Sir G. Clerk ... **No. 151**	„ 27	Turkish railways ... Reports opening of Kutahya–Balikesir Railway and on progress of others under construction	77
38 Sir G. Clerk **No. 152**	„ 24	Turkey and the League of Nations ... Reports conversations with Turkish Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs, especially on Turkey's decision to join the League, although she would like to be invited to do so by the Great Powers	78
39 Sir G. Clerk **No. 153**	„ 28	Anglo-Turkish Mixed Arbitral Tribunal ... Reports closure of tribunal and encloses report by British agent on work done since 1925. Doubts readiness of Turkish Government to execute judgments. Appreciation of president, M. Hammarskjold and of British agent and judge	79
40 Sir G. Clerk ... **No. 154**	„ 28	Russo-Turkish relations ... Refers to No. 38. Reports departure of Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs on visit to Moscow. Emphasis laid by press on Russo-Turkish friendship	90
41 Mr. Strang (Moscow) **No. 69. Tel.**	May 8	Russo-Turkish relations ... Reports official communiqué reviewing results of Ismet Pasha's visit. Agreement of principle reached on steps for more effective contact. Opening by Soviet Government in Turkey's favour of 8 million dollar credit	90
42 Mr. Strang ... **No. 231**	„ 3	Russo-Turkish relations ... Reports details of visit to Moscow of Turkish Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs. Soviet Government spared no pains to honour their guests. Analyses reasons for this	91
43 Sir E. Ovey **No. 241**	„ 9	Russo-Turkish relations ... Refers to No. 42. Transmits memorandum by Mr. Rolland reporting on Turkish Prime Minister's visit to Leningrad and discusses business agreement under which large credit has been opened in Turkey's favour	94
44 Sir G. Clerk ... **No. 157**	„ 8	Turkish political situation ... Reports on disposal of members of dissolved Liberal party, most of whom have rejoined the Popular party. Fethi Bey remains in retirement, but still enjoys Ghazi's favour	97
45 Sir G. Clerk ... **No. 164**	„ 13	Russo-Turkish relations ... Refers to No. 40. Reports Prime Minister's return from Moscow. Discusses grant of Soviet credit to Turkey. It will certainly ease the financial situation	98

Printed for the use of the Foreign Office.

CONFIDENTIAL.

Further Correspondence respecting Turkey.

PART XXIII.

[E 30/30/44] No. 1.

Mr. Morgan to Sir John Simon.—(*Received January* 4, 1932.)

(No. 437.)

Sir, *Angora, December* 27, 1931.

WITH reference to Sir George Clerk's despatch No. 26 of the 26th January, 1931, I have the honour to transmit herewith the annual report on the heads of missions in Turkey in 1931.

2 The passages enclosed in brackets have been taken from previous reports.

I have, &c.

JAMES MORGAN.

Enclosure in No. 1

Reports on Heads of Foreign Missions.

AMBASSADORS.

Russia.

(M. JACQUES SOURITZ, fully accredited Ambassador, presented his credentials on the 13th June, 1923. As soon as the reopening of diplomatic relations with His Majesty's Government was practically assured, M. Souritz made a point of showing his desire for renewing our personal relations, a desire to which I have willingly responded, for he is intelligent, his inner knowledge of the Turkish Government is probably better than that of any other diplomatist here, and it is always possible to discuss with him the questions dividing our two countries in an objective and reasonable manner.

As doyen of the Diplomatic Corps, M. Souritz is not altogether satisfactory, for his Government's desire to pose as Turkey's first and special friend precludes him from joining the other heads of missions in offering any unwelcome representations to the Turkish Government.

M. Souritz is married to a pleasant Russian *bourgeoise*, who has little or no bolshevism in her composition. 1929.)

Germany.

(Herr Rudolf Nadolny, fully accredited Ambassador, presented credentials on the 31st March, 1925. Herr Nadolny is little loved either by the Turks or his staff or his colleagues. His overbearing tactlessness estranges the Turks, his lack of consideration estranges his staff, while these qualities, added to a doubtful loyalty, naturally do not endear him to his colleagues. So far as Turkey is concerned, he will go down to history as one of the chief protagonists of new Angora, whither the German Embassy was officially transferred in December 1928. 1928.)

(Notwithstanding his vaunted enthusiasm for Angora, however, he seems to contrive to spend a very small proportion of the year there, and even then his entertaining is reduced to a minimum. On the other hand, the counsellor, Herr Aschmann, who will be remembered as German representative at Geneva before the entry of Germany into the League, and his wife are among the most hospitable folk in Angora, and are very widely and deservedly popular. 1930.)

United States of America.

(The Hon. Joseph Grew, fully accredited Ambassador, presented his credentials on the 12th October, 1927, after the signature of the agreement between the United States and Turkey, which made it possible for the former Government to replace its High Commissioner, Admiral Bristol, by an Ambassador. The change has been, from our point of view, all to the good. Mrs. Grew and the two daughters are, like the Ambassador, pleasant and good to look upon, and have made a welcome addition to Constantinople society. 1929.)

(Mr. Grew is a loyal colleague and a great gentleman, and is deservedly respected alike by the Turks and by the American and foreign communities. 1928.)

France.

(Count Charles de Chambrun, fully accredited Ambassador, presented his credentials on the 28th September, 1928. During the succeeding two years relations have, thanks in no small measure to the efforts of M. de Chambrun, entered a phase of normal harmony, which is only disturbed under the occasional influence of such thorny problems as the debt question. 1930.)

(It was understood, on M. de Chambrun's arrival in this country, that he would spend the major part of his time in Angora. Nevertheless, he has tended to drift back to Constantinople, except when serious negotiations with the Turkish Government make his presence in Angora indispensable. The French Government have not yet embarked upon the construction of a proper Embassy at Angora.

M. de Chambrun, who is unmarried, is a pleasant and cultivated colleague, who makes a point of doing service to the spirit of Anglo-French friendship. 1929.)

Italy.

(Baron Pompeo Aloisi, fully accredited Ambassador, presented his credentials on the 12th April, 1930, having been transferred to Angora, to his great delight, from Tokyo. So far, my experience of him does not incline me to repose in him any greater confidence than he inspired in Sir John Tilley. His wife is distinguished by a vivacity more appropriate to her fictive than to her real age. She is believed to hold the strings of a well-filled purse, and it is clear that the new Ambassador will achieve the feat of entertaining even less than the members of his staff. The Italian Government have taken, at an exorbitant rent, two villas for the accommodation of the Ambassador and for offices, and the Embassy is now definitely in Angora during the winter months. 1930.)

Japan.

Mr. Isaburo Yoshida, fully accredited Ambassador, presented his credentials on the 19th April, 1930. He called on me in Constantinople after this event, and then went on leave for a prolonged period. He is short, stout and jovial, and speaks English of a sort, but is little seen, least of all in Angora.

It was reported in the Turkish press at the end of the year that the Ambassador had been recalled to Tokyo, as he was to be appointed judicial adviser to the League of Nations Commission of Enquiry which is to proceed to Manchuria.

Poland.

(M. Casimir Olszowski, fully accredited Ambassador, presented his credentials on the 8th October, 1930. M. Olszowski had previously been Minister at Angora, but the Legation was raised to the status of an Embassy on the 1st June, 1930. The new Embassy house was opened early in the year, and is, like the German Embassy, a haven of substantiality in an ocean of jerry-building.

The large hospitality dispensed by the Ambassador and his lady have made it the principal social centre of Angora. At the end of the year it was rumoured that M. Olszowski was to be replaced by M. Wysocki from the Ministry for Foreign Affairs in Warsaw and transferred to Moscow. 1930.) He succeeded, however, in averting this calamity.

Afghanistan.

Sultan Ahmad Khan, fully accredited Ambassador, presented his credentials on the 28th March, 1931. He is short and somewhat ape-like in appearance, with a fixed grin revealing numerous gold teeth, speaks fair English, and shows himself very friendly to all and sundry. He seems to have a sneaking sympathy for Amanullah, with whom he claims relationship, and also for his own (pro-Amanullah) predecessor, Ghulam Nabi Khan, who, since he ceased to be Ambassador, has been living somewhat mysteriously at Constantinople.

Sultan Ahmad Khan is married, but his wife has not been known to appear in public, and is believed to possess no language but her own.

Persia.

Mirza Sadik Khan Sadiki, formerly known as Musteshar-ed-Dowleh, fully accredited Ambassador, presented his credentials on the 28th March, 1931. He is a retiring but pleasant colleague, speaks French and Turkish, and possesses a dignity of manner in inverse ratio to his minute proportions.

He lost no time in moving into the colossal new Embassy building, which still lacks the road of approach long since promised by the Turkish Government, and has the distinction of being the largest and ugliest diplomatic house in Angora.

Ministers.

Hungary.

(M. Tahy de Tahvar et Tarkeo, fully accredited Minister, presented his credentials on the 5th May, 1924.

M. de Tahy's impatience of the ways of the Turk does not diminish—1928), but Count Bethlen's visit to Angora in 1930 has smoothed off some of the sharper angles.

Austria.

(M. Auguste Kral, fully accredited Minister, presented his credentials on the 11th November, 1924. I have nothing to add to my predecessor's estimate of M. Kral, who, with his wife and grown-up daughter, are pleasant enough colleagues, though inclined to stop on at lunches and dinners long after the other guests, who are waiting for them to leave first, have ceased to enjoy themselves. 1927.) (But M. Kral contrives to convey an impression of insincerity, and I should not trust him farther than I could see him, if as far. 1930.)

He was run over by a horse and cart on the last day of 1930, and, after some months in the Angora hospital and a prolonged convalescence in his own country, returned to Angora in December 1931, much reduced in bulk, but otherwise unchanged.

Spain.

(Don Juan Servert y Vest, fully accredited Minister, presented his credentials on the 3rd August, 1925. I regret that I have had but little contact with the hermit of Buyuk-Déré, but at such times as I have seen him, M. Servert has appeared to be pleasant and jovial. 1927.)

His Royalist sympathies and fervent Catholicism have not as yet lost him his post, a fact which he explains by saying that the men of the new régime in Spain have not yet had time to "occupy themselves with his poor person."

Czechoslovakia.

(M. Milos Kobr, fully accredited Minister, presented his credentials on the 18th January, 1926. M. Kobr retains his love of a horse and of physical robustness, and Mme. Kobr still continues to cook the cakes for her fortnightly receptions during the Angora season. 1928.)

Bulgaria.

(M. Theodore Pavloff, fully accredited Minister, presented his credentials on the 5th May, 1927. M. Pavloff and his wife are favourable representatives of their country. He was, I understand, at one time a member of the Turkish Assembly, in the Committee of Union and Progress days, an experience that no doubt helps him in his task. 1927.)

Belgium.

(M. Louis Leclercq, fully accredited Minister, presented his credentials on the 11th June, 1928. M. Leclercq was formerly counsellor in Rome, where he acquired a devotion to all the amenities of town life, which—were it not for the distraction of bridge—would make his annual four months' solitude at Angora rather hard for him to bear. He is simple and very friendly, and is unmarried. 1928.)

Switzerland.

(M. Henri Martin has been raised to the rank of Minister, and presented his credentials on the 11th November, 1928.

While in Angora M. Martin is invaluable for obtaining information on points of detail, and prides himself on the number of despatches which he writes to Berne. At Constantinople he is driven to circularise his colleagues; while on leave he breeds dogs in England. M. Martin would like to be taken for an Englishman. 1928.)

Greece.

(M. Spyridon Polykhroniadis, fully accredited Minister, presented his credentials on the 30th November, 1929.

Speaks English and is distinctly Anglophil, but too prone to engage in lengthy political discussions and to imagine that His Majesty's Government are as engrossed in Balkan politics as he is himself. His ideas seem, however, fundamentally sensible, and the successful culmination of Græco-Turkish negotiations this year would suggest that he is distinctly *persona grata* here. His wife, a Serbian lady, considerably younger than himself, whom he married just before leaving Belgrade, is an agreeable woman, who likewise speaks some English. Both are characterised, on the tennis court and at the bridge table, by an ardour somewhat out of proportion to their skill. They entertain very pleasantly, notwithstanding the limitations of a Turkish house—which is soon to be replaced by a new Legation building. 1930.)

Roumania.

(M. P. Carp, fully accredited Minister, presented his credentials on the 29th May, 1930, and again on the 16th October, in consequence of the proclamation of Prince Carol as King of Roumania.

A friendly and insignificant-looking little man. His wife speaks fluent English, and is distinguished by a somewhat overwhelming affability and an inconvenient ardour for tennis. 1930.)

Egypt.

(Abdel Malek Hamza Bey, fully accredited Minister, presented his credentials on the 8th October, 1930. He was counsellor of the Egyptian Legation in London in 1929, and has been described by His Majesty's High Commissioner at Cairo as a leading lawyer and a clever and active young man, who, from extreme nationalism, has been converted to reasonable views, largely by contact with English people. He is extremely friendly, and speaks quite good English, but very little Turkish. Is apparently unmarried. 1930.)

Norway.

M. Sigurd Bentzon, fully accredited Minister, presented his letters of credence on the 8th October, 1930, the first Norwegian Minister to be accredited to Turkey. He is tall and distinguished-looking, speaks perfect English, and has a charming and vivacious English wife, who more than holds her own with the younger women of the Diplomatic Corps, both for looks and general attractiveness.

Yugoslavia.

(M. Ljuba Nesitch, fully accredied Minister, presented his credentials on the 16th October. As soon as he can complete the installation of a house he has taken in Angora he is likely to spend a considerable part of the winter there, a wise departure from the practice of his predecessors, on whom he is, indeed, a most welcome improvement. He has been given a credit for the construction of a new Legation at Angora, and hopes to get work started in 1931. I should not be surprised if he succeeds in effecting a very real improvement in Turco-Yugoslav relations. He is married. 1930.)

Denmark.

M. Peter Christian Schou, fully accredited Minister, presented his letters of credence on the 4th May, 1931.

Brazil.

M. D. de Pimentel Brandão, fully accredited Minister, presented his letters of credence on the 5th July, 1931, the first Brazilian representative to be accredited to Turkey. He speaks excellent French, having been *en poste* in Paris for years, and is pleasant company, though shy, as he himself confesses.

Finland.

M. Pontus Artti, fully accredited Minister, presented his credentials on the 12th November, 1931. He is the first Finnish representative to be accredited to Turkey.

Sweden.

M. Erik Boheman, fully accredited Minister, presented his credentials on the 30th November, 1931. He left Angora a few days afterwards for Geneva, where he is to represent his Government on the Disarmament Conference, and it seems probable that the extremely uncomfortable house leased, but never inhabited, by his predecessor in the former city will conduce to extensive periods of sojourn in the latter.

Though still in the thirties, M. Boheman has already had a brilliant career in the Swedish Foreign Office, where he became head of the Political Department in 1928.

Netherlands.

M. van Ketvich Verschuur, fully accredited Minister, presented his letters of credence on the 30th November, 1931.

Chargés d'Affaires.

Chile.

(M. Hector Briones Luco, the first Chilean diplomatic representative to be accredited to Turkey, arrived in this country in April to take up his duties as Chargé d'Affaires. 1929.) (Further than this nothing is known of him. 1930.)

Iraq.

Naci Shevket (Shaukat) Bey was recalled to Bagdad in October 1931 to become Minister of the Interior in Nuri Pasha's new Cabinet. He has not yet been replaced, and the Legation is meanwhile in charge of Ata Emin Bey, the first secretary, a rotund, good-natured young man, who speaks English fluently and is as frank and as Anglophil as could be desired, in marked contrast to his late chief.

Vatican.

(Mgr. Carlo Margotti, titular Archbishop of Mesembria, succeeded Mgr. Rotta as Apostolic Delegate to Turkey in April 1930. He had previously been a member both of the Roman Congregation for the Eastern Churches and of the Papal Commission for Russia.

Unlike his predecessor, Mgr. Margotti has never called upon me, but a member of my staff who has met him reports that he is affable, somewhat boyish in appearance, and creates a favourable general impression. While not officially recognised by the "lay" Turkish Government, he nevertheless enjoys *de facto* diplomatic immunity. 1930.)

Mgr. Margotti, in response to a hint conveyed by a leading Catholic member of the British colony, called on me during the past year, and enabled me personally to confirm the favourable impression referred to in last year's report.

[E 33/33/34] No. 2

Mr. Morgan to Sir John Simon.—(Received January 4, 1932.)

(No. 445.)

Sir, *Angora, December 30, 1931.*

WITH reference to my despatch No. 436 of the 23rd December regarding the visit of the Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs to Tehran, I have the honour to report that Dr. Tevfik Rüştü Bey will leave Constantinople for Persia on the 4th January viâ the Black Sea and the Caucasus. On the conclusion of his visit he will return to Turkey viâ Bagdad.

2. Nuri Pasha, Prime Minister for Iraq, who is here at present negotiating agreements with Turkey, and who is on terms of old friendship with Tevfik Rüştü Bey, informed me that the principal object of the journey is to conclude the discussions between Turkey and Persia regarding their joint frontier. Nuri Pasha fears that the Persian Government will take advantage of the visit to enlist the co-operation of Turkey in pressing Iraq to agree that the whole Persian frontier line from Russia to the Persian Gulf should be the object of discussion, on the specious ground that the question of this frontier has been under negotiation since pre-war times; and that as the present negotiations are a continuation of pre-war negotiations it is only right that concessions made to Turkey in regard to what is now Iraq territory in the earlier period of frontier negotiations, should now be balanced by Turkish concessions in the north and Iraq concessions in the south. Nuri Pasha rightly qualifies this reasoning (if, indeed, the Persian Government has indulged in it) as ridiculous, but would not be surprised if one of the results of the Turco-Persian conversations were a Persian request, unofficially seconded by Turkey, for Iraq agreement to the thalweg of the Shatt-el-Arab being the frontier line between Persia and Iraq.

3. According to Nuri Pasha the present decision of the Persian Government to invite Tevfik Rüştü to Tehran is due to Russian prompting. He has noticed that whereas a year ago Turkey was sheering away from Russia towards the Western Powers, and was most strongly attracted by Italian influence, to which was due in great part the rapprochement with Greece, Italian influence has now waned, and Turkey has drifted back to her Russian comrade with whom she is more closely knit than before. Under Russian advice Tevfik Rüştü will look rather to the Shah for assistance in overcoming difficulties in connexion with the coming discussions than to Teymourtache, the former being alleged to be more frank, open to reason and tractable than the latter. If, as mentioned in my despatch No. 436 of the 23rd December, Tevfik Rüştü was sincere in assuring me that his visit to Tehran would be beneficial to His Majesty's Government, it may be that the Russian initiative, presumed by Nuri Pasha, was linked with a Russian suggestion that the susceptibilities of His Majesty's Government must be considered in the course of the discussions.

4. During a rambling, and not always lucid, talk with Nuri Pasha, Tevfik Rüştü suggested that an agreement should be made between Turkey, Persia and Iraq to collaborate if Kurdish troubles recurred on any of the frontiers of the three nations. Nuri Pasha expressed his willingness to watch the Turkish frontier if Turkey were having trouble with Kurds near the Iraq frontier, and also to watch the Persian frontier if Persia were having similar trouble near the Perso-Iraq frontier, but failed to understand how he could collaborate if trouble was confined to the Turco-Persian frontier. It is possible that Tevfik Rüştü expected that Iraq would in such a case make some public utterance, or engage in some activity of a nature to discourage Kurds within her own borders from associating themselves with rebels in Turkey or Persia, and to show these rebels

that they could not count on any support in Iraq, but definite details in this respect did not emerge from Tevfik Rüştü Bey's discursiveness.

5. I am sending a copy of this despatch to His Majesty's High Commissioner at Bagdad and His Majesty's Minister at Tehran.

I have, &c.
JAMES MORGAN.

[E 34/34/44] No. 3.

Mr. Morgan to Sir John Simon.—(Received January 4, 1932.)

(No. 446.)

Sir, *Angora, December 30, 1931.*

I HAVE the honour to report that, in consideration of the serious economic crisis through which this country is passing, it was recently decided to create two new Ministries with a view to relieving the congestion of work in the Ministries of Finance and National Economy and concentrating on the now supremely important domains of customs administration and agriculture. Government Bills were accordingly introduced in the Grand National Assembly on the 29th December, and duly approved by the Deputies, for the creation of a Ministry of Customs and Monopolies and another of Agriculture. This morning's semi-official "Hakimiyeti Milliye" announces that Rana Bey, Deputy for Constantinople, and Muhlis Bey, Deputy for Kütahya, have been appointed Minister of Customs and Monopolies and Minister of Agriculture respectively.

2. The need for a separate Ministry of Customs and Monopolies is stated in the new law to be due to the special importance which customs operations and the working of the monopolies have recently acquired, as well as the urgency of preventing contraband; these considerations have necessitated the devising of stringent measures, the successful execution of which demands the withdrawal of such matters from the Ministry of Finance and the creation of a special Ministry to deal with them. Moreover, the unification of the hitherto separate administrations of customs and monopolies and their concentration in the capital will reduce the budgetary expenditure under these heads. Similarly, the institution of a Ministry of Agriculture is justified on the ground that the materials of economic operations (*i.e.*, agricultural produce) have acquired a world-wide importance, and that so much work of an economic and scientific nature is required to give agriculture its necessary development that the transference of these activities from the Ministry of National Economy and the creation of a separate Ministry of Agriculture is clearly desirable in the interests of the State. Nor is this decision likely to involve considerable additional expense, in view of the fact that the essential organisation of the two branches is already in existence.

3. The new Minister of Customs and Monopolies, (Ali) Rana Bey, who was then Deputy for Samsun, represented Turkey at the Universal Postal Congress held in London in 1929, and was formerly a post office official. He became Deputy for Constantinople in April 1931, and was soon afterwards elected vice-president of the Budget Commission of the Grand National Assembly. He speaks a little English, and is understood to harbour grateful memories of the numerous official attentions received during his visit to England.

4. Muhlis Bey, the new Minister of Agriculture, is a graduate of the Halkali Agricultural College, where he taught for a number of years, finally becoming its rector. He has also studied in Germany. He was Under-Secretary for Agriculture in 1926 and 1927, became Deputy for Brusa in the latter year, and in April 1931 exchanged his seat for Kütahya. He was soon afterwards elected secretary of the Assembly Budget Commission, of which his colleague (Rana Bey) was vice-president. Full biographies of the new Ministers will be transmitted in January with the list of Turkish personalities for 1931.

5. The creation of the new Ministries has resulted, according to the press, in the resignation of Behçet Bey, director-general of the Tobacco Monopoly, and the appointment of Ihsan Rifat Bey, Director-General of Customs, to the post of commissaire of the Constantinople Bourse.

I have, &c.
JAMES MORGAN.

[E 35/35/93] No. 4.

Mr. Morgan to Sir John Simon.—(Received January 4, 1932.)

(No. 447.)

Sir, *Angora, December 30, 1931.*

WITH reference to my despatch No. 430 of the 22nd December, regarding the visit to Turkey of Nuri Pasha, Prime Minister of Iraq, I have the honour to report that he arrived at Angora on the 28th instant, and was met at the station by Ismet Pasha. He has since been engaged in negotiations for the conclusion of commercial, residence and extradition treaties, and in discussion of problems relating to the Turco-Iraqi frontier.

2. He has informed me that the negotiations are proceeding smoothly. He had expected that Turkey would make difficulties about accepting his proposal that Iraqi shepherds should be allowed access with their flocks to Turkish pastures, even though he offered to pay rent for the privilege, and his expectations have proved correct. While not flatly rejecting his proposal, the Turkish negotiators do so in effect, by objecting to the shepherds being either Assyrians or tribesmen.

3. With regard to the security of the frontier, the Turks seem willing to delegate authority to a Turkish gendarmerie officer, to be stationed close to the frontier to act promptly in case of frontier raids in concert with a specially appointed Iraqi frontier officer. Nuri Pasha's suggestion that Turkish troops should be sent to the frontier to close it to followers of Sheikh Ahmad of Barzan, who has recently been disturbing the peace in Iraq, was met by the statement that it was impracticable, as no troop movements would be possible in the district concerned until June.

4. The Turkish attitude towards Assyrians is interesting. Although unwilling to allow Assyrian shepherds to enter Turkey, the Turkish Government some years ago raised no objection to the return of about 500 Assyrians from Iraq to their native mountains in Turkey, where they still are, and now urge Nuri Pasha to do what he can to prevent the Assyrians now settled in Iraq near the Turkish frontier from emigrating to Syria, firstly, because they can be used in Iraq to keep their Kurdish neighbours in check, and secondly, because Turkey does not wish that Assyrians should go to swell the non-Moslem minorities already established in Syria close to the Turkish frontier.

5. I am sending a copy of this despatch to His Majesty's High Commissioner in Bagdad.

I have, &c.
JAMES MORGAN.

[E 130/33/34] No. 5.

Sir John Simon to Sir G. Clerk (Constantinople).

(No. 11.)

Sir, *Foreign Office, January 8, 1932.*

THE Turkish Ambassador told me to-day that the Turkish Foreign Minister was on his way to Tehran in order to carry through a negotiation for a small modification of the line of the Turco-Persian frontier. He explained that at present the line runs through Mount Ararat, and that parties of brigands on the Turkish side, when pursued, escaped over the boundary, and *vice versâ*. Consequently, it is proposed that the whole of the mountain should be thrown within Turkish territory, and that Persia should receive by way of compensation a piece of territory further south which is now on the Turkish side of the line. The scheme for this exchange had already been under discussion, and the Foreign Minister's journey was for the purpose of carrying it through.

Ferit Bey added that on his return journey the Turkish Foreign Minister might arrange to pass through Bagdad, but, if he did so, the visit would be for the purpose of establishing personal contact with the Iraqi Government and had no special object.

I am, &c.
JOHN SIMON.

[E 260/35/93] No. 6.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(Received January 16.)

(No. 1. Saving.)

(Telegraphic.) *En clair.* *Angora, January 11, 1932.*

RESIDENCE Convention and Treaties of Commerce and Extradition between Turkey and Iraq were signed at Angora yesterday. Press states that first two agreements are based on most-favoured treatment, and that ratifications will be exchanged at Bagdad.

Texts will be forwarded as soon as possible.

(Repeated to Bagdad. No. 1, Saving.)

[C 411/411/22] No. 7.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(Received January 14.)

(No. 8.)

Sir, *Constantinople, January 6, 1932.*

I HAVE the honour to report that an agreement, defining the maritime frontier between Turkey and Italy, was signed on the 4th instant at Angora by the Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs and the Italian Ambassador. The agreement is subject to ratification.

2. I am informed by the Italian Embassy that it had been intended to submit the matter to arbitration at The Hague, but that Turkey was ultimately persuaded by the Italian Government to agree to settle by direct understanding. As a result of the agreement Italy will cede to Turkey the small islet known as Kara Ada, formerly a dependency of the Island of Cos, and lying near the Turkish coast about 10 miles east of Budrum, and Turkey will recognise Italian ownership, and sovereignty over, the islets of Hypsili and St. George (Haghios Georhios or Ro) lying close to Castellorizo (Castel rosso) and of a few islets lying close to the north-east side of that island. The maritime frontier defined in the agreement follows a line beginning 3 miles south of Volos, running practically mid-way between Castellorizo and the mainland, and ending 3 miles south of Tuga Point (Tugh Burnu).

3. The official communiqué issued on the 5th instant, after referring briefly and without details to the conclusion of the agreement, states that it will reinforce the strong friendship, based on mutual confidence, existing between the two nations, and that there does not now exist any important question at issue between them.

4. I am sending a copy of this despatch to His Majesty's Ambassador at Rome.

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK

[E 223/33/34] No. 8.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(Received January 14.)

(No. 9. Confidential.)

Sir, *Constantinople, January 6, 1932.*

WITH reference to Mr. Morgan's despatch No. 436 of the 23rd December last, I have the honour to report that, when I called upon the Minister for Foreign Affairs this morning on my return from leave, his Excellency, who is here for two or three days waiting for the steamer that is to take him to Batum, began our conversation by telling me why he was going to Persia, and why he was going at this rather uncomfortable season of the year.

2. He was going now simply because, if he did not do so, he would, what with the Disarmament Conference and the visits he had to make to Moscow and Rome, be unable to go until late in the summer, whereas it was eminently desirable to settle up with the Persians as soon as possible

3. As to why he was going at all, it was nominally, but also quite truthfully, in order to reach a definite settlement of the frontier question. He had told me in November, just before I went on leave, that he would go to Tehran if by so doing he could bring these protracted frontier negotiations to an end, and since then it had become quite clear to him that this was the only way to bring this about. The representatives of both countries, who had been conducting the actual negotiations, had reached agreement upon the really essential points, but they were haggling over other claims and counter-claims that did not really matter and were getting lost in the thicket of rather futile and unnecessary discussions which threatened, unless brought to an abrupt end, to envenom and upset the whole thing. Ismet Pasha had, therefore, entirely agreed with the Minister for Foreign Affairs that the only thing to do was for his Excellency to go to Tehran and settle the question on broad lines over the heads of the subordinate negotiators.

4. Obviously, it was not impossible to do this without undergoing the discomforts of a winter journey to Persia, though the fact that the Persians would be flattered by the visit would, no doubt, contribute to make the final negotiations easier, but Ismet Pasha and Dr. Tevfik Rüştü were taking advantage of this excellent pretext in order that the latter might gauge for himself the real feeling in Tehran towards Turkey. His Excellency said that for some time he had noticed a certain reserve, or rather nervousness, in the Persian attitude towards Turkey, a nervousness which could not be entirely attributed to the rather small difficulties of the frontier negotiations, and the Turkish Government wanted to get to the bottom of this feeling and either dissipate it or adjust their policy accordingly. If it was found that Persia's uneasiness simply arose from failure to grasp the sincerity of Turkish policy, the Turkish Government felt that the best way to set the Persian minds at ease was by personal contact between the Turkish Foreign Minister and His Majesty the Shah and his responsible advisers, including particularly Teymourtache. The Turkish Government wanted Persia to understand that Turkey's desire for friendship was loyal and sincere, but if Tevfik Rüştü Bey found that the Persians failed to respond to the spirit of his visit, then Turkey would draw the natural inference and take all necessary precautions against what the Minister for Foreign Affairs called "a Persian stab in the back."

5. His Excellency said that it was only to me that he had given these explanations, because he realised how closely interested we were in Persia, and he wished us to know exactly the motives for his visit.

6. I should add that Tevfik Rüştü Bey proposes to proceed from Tehran to Bagdad to visit King Feisal and, presumably, put the finishing touches to the discussions which Nuri Pasha has been having with his Excellency in Angora.

7. I am sending a copy of this despatch to His Majesty's Minister in Tehran.

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK.

[E 226/226/89] No. 9.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(Received January 14.)

(No. 13.)
Sir, *Constantinople, January 6, 1932.*

WITH reference to Mr. Morgan's despatch No. 433 of the 23rd December last, I have the honour to report that I took the opportunity of my visit to the Minister for Foreign Affairs this morning to remind his Excellency of his fears that King Feisal was a candidate for the Throne of Syria, and to say that it looked at present as though the ex-Khedive, Abbas Hilmi Pasha, was now more prominent in that respect.

2. Tevfik Rüştü Bey replied that he agreed that King Feisal's candidature was dead, and said that, in principle, Turkey would prefer to see a republic in Syria; but if there was to be a King, the Turkish Government had no objections to Abbas Hilmi, whom they knew well and considered as a friend of Turkey. In fact, he had taken means to let King Fuad know this, thinking that His Majesty would like to see a member of the Khedivial house succeed to the throne, but it had been made clear to him that this was not at all King Fuad's view. The matter had consequently gone no further, though I have little doubt that Turkey's support of the candidature of Abbas Hilmi was a good deal warmer than the Minister for Foreign Affairs led me to suppose.

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK.

[E 227/35/93] No. 10.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(Received January 14.)

(No. 15.)
Sir, *Constantinople, January 8, 1932.*

WITH reference to Mr. Morgan's despatch No. 447 of the 30th December, 1931, regarding the Turco-Iraq negotiations at Angora for the conclusion of commercial, residence and extradition treaties, I have the honour to report that Nuri Pasha hopes to reach agreement with the Turkish Government within a day or two.

2. According to Nuri Pasha the final form of the commercial and residence treaties will call for little comment. As for the Extradition Treaty, he has admitted that the murder of a Prime Minister of Turkey or Iraq shall not be considered a political offence, and has resisted Turkish pressure on him to agree that Iraq should deliver up non-Iraqis—other than Turks—accused or convicted of offences committed in Turkey. He went, however, as far as to promise that Iraq would be willing to deliver up to Turkey Persians or Syrians accused or convicted of offences committed in Turkey, but declined to give this promise in writing, either in the treaty or as an annex to the treaty. With regard to Europeans guilty of offences in Turkey, the Turkish negotiators grumbled at Nuri Pasha's refusal to agree that Iraq should deliver them up to Turkey, and their annoyance found vent in the remark that his refusal was, no doubt, forced on him by Europeans, who, they said, were still unwilling to trust Turkish justice. Coming to the question of expenses incurred in extraditing wanted persons, the two parties would agree that each would abstain from claiming a refund from the other.

3. Other matters treated during the negotiations were—

(*a*) Co-operation on the Turco-Iraq frontier, with regard to which it was agreed that special frontier officers should be appointed by both sides to keep in close touch in order to deal promptly with frontier incidents.

(*b*) Access of Iraq flocks to Turkish grazing grounds. This question was still unsettled.

(*c*) Entry of Iraq dates into Turkey. Turkey had agreed to allow dates to the value of £T. 100,000 to enter annually, with a 12 per cent. preferential reduction of customs duty.

(*d*) Turkish participation in Iraq oil royalties, with regard to which I am sending a separate despatch.

4. I am sending a copy of this despatch to His Majesty's High Commissioner at Bagdad.

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK.

[E 229/229/89] No. 11.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(Received January 14.)

(No. 17.)
Sir, *Constantinople, January 8, 1932.*

I HAVE the honour to report that Nuri Pasha, Prime Minister of Iraq, who during his stay in Angora for his treaty negotiations has freely associated with the Gazi, the Turkish Ministers and other leading Turks, most of whom are old friends of his, has informed me that the Turkish Government are closely watching

events in Syria. They are hoping that the evolution of Syrian affairs may give them an opportunity of obtaining the cession to them of Alexandretta. It is their belief that France, which formerly abandoned to them Cilicia, may be induced to make this further concession. With regard to the internal constitution of Syria, Turkish statesmen dislike its division into numerous States, and especially the existence of the State of the Grand Lebanon. Although Nuri Pasha did not say so, I assume that the Turkish Government view with disfavour the existence of the Lebanese State because it destroys any hope of complete French withdrawal from Syria, a consummation which, as suggested *passim* in Mr. Morgan's despatches Nos. 432 and 433 of the 23rd December, Turkey devoutly desires.

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK.

[E 464/33/34] No. 12.

Sir John Simon to Sir G. Clerk (Angora).

(No. 42.)
Sir, *Foreign Office, January 28, 1932.*

IN the course of our conversation this afternoon, Ferit Bey referred to the readjustment of boundaries between Turkey and Persia, about which he spoke to me the other day. The treaty for the exchange of territory was signed at Tehran on the 23rd instant, and, as a result, when it was ratified, the whole of Mount Ararat would be within the boundaries of Turkey, while, by way of compensation, a corresponding area further south would be transferred to the Persian side of the line.

I am, &c.
JOHN SIMON.

[E 438/438/44] No. 13.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(Received January 29.)

(No. 21. Confidential.)
Sir, *Angora, January 14, 1932.*

WITH reference to my despatch No. 36, Confidential, of the 31st January, 1931, and to the Marquess of Reading's circular despatch of the 31st August last, I have the honour to transmit to you herewith a complete series of notes on the leading Turkish personalities, revised up to date by Mr. Knight.

2. I have omitted from the present report the biographies of Dr. Adnan Bey, Ali Fuat Pasha, Bekir Sami Bey, Hüseyin Rauf Bey, Ihsan Bey, Nurettin Pasha and Rahmi Bey. Although they are by no means negligible and may possibly be heard of in the future, they have been little in the public eye for some years. I have added four new biographies, namely, those of Izzettin Pasha, Kemalettin Sami Pasha, Muhlis Bey and Rana Bey.

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK.

Enclosure in No. 13.

Notes on Leading Turkish Personalities.

Abdulhalik Bey, Mustafa.

BORN at Yanina about 1870. Belongs to a family of Albanian Tosks. Educated at Yanina and at Mülkiye College, Constantinople. In 1908 appointed member of the Council of State. Uncle by marriage of the late Talat Pasha. In 1910–11, Vali of Skoplje (Üsküp). 1914–15, Vali of Van. For a short period in 1915 was Under-Secretary for the Interior. 1915–16, Vali of Bitlis, and 1916–17 of Aleppo. Again became Under-Secretary for the Interior, holding

post until the armistice. Arrested in May 1920 and deported to Malta on charge of atrocities committed at Aleppo during the war. Learnt to play tennis and bridge there. In 1923 was Vali of Smyrna, when he got on well with Europeans. In July elected Deputy for Çankiri. In January 1924 succeeded Hasan Fehmi Bey as Minister of Finance, and held post till March 1925. Resigned on fall of Fethi Bey and became director-general of the Agricultural Bank and chairman of the Parliamentary Committee of Finance. In July 1926 became Minister of Finance. He soon showed himself aware of the weakness of Turkey's financial position abroad, and visited Europe in the summer of 1927, when he was identified with an arrangement for the settlement of the "coupons" question. In September he was re-elected Deputy for Çankiri, and in November, on the reconstruction of Ismet Pasha's Cabinet, became Minister of National Defence and Acting Minister of Marine. The latter post was subsequently merged in the former, which he retained in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet as reconstructed in September 1930. Succeeded Saracoğlu Şükrü Bey as Minister of Finance in December 1930, and retained his portfolio in Ismet Pasha's new Cabinet, May 1931.

Abdulhalik Bey knows Greek and speaks indifferent French. He owed his early advancement to his relationship with Talat Pasha, though he was never a prominent Unionist figure. Though not possessed of brilliance, he has considerable administrative capacity, and enjoys a reputation for scrupulous honesty—a virtue as acceptable at the Ministry of Finance as in that of Defence, where peculation in connexion with munitions contracts had previously been rampant. Is essentially a moderate, and the only member of the Cabinet to observe the Ramazan Fast. Is a keen gardener, a good bridge player and agreeable in conversation. Much liked by representatives of foreign business firms seeking contracts.

Ahmet Bey, Agaoglu.

Born about 1864 in Russian Azerbaijan. Son of an Islamised Caucasian Jew. Educated at Moscow, and started life as a journalist. Became an *agent provocateur* to the Russian Secret Service and organised Armenian massacres at Baku in 1904. In 1903–5 published two newspapers in Baku, but then fell into disgrace; went to Turkey and became a Turkish subject in 1908. Threw in his lot with the Committee of Union and Progress. Later, published a pro-Russian paper in Turkish, and became editor of the "Tercumani Hakikat." In 1916 became Minister of Education, and at this time was noted for his anti-British articles. Took a part in organising the Armenian massacres. In 1918 received £T. 100,000 from the Committee of Union and Progress funds. 1919–21, interned at Malta, where he learnt some English. In June 1921 he became director of the Press Bureau at Angora, and from then onwards was a close friend of Mustafa Kemal. Was in the past the chief worker for closer Russo-Turkish relations, often by means of editorial articles in the officially-inspired "Hakimiyeti Milliye," of which he was one of the editors.

In the 1923–27 Assembly he was a member of the Executive Bureau of the People's party and of the Foreign Affairs Commission, as well as reporter of the Constitutional Commission. Was re-elected Deputy for Kars in September 1927, and in November became a member of the party's Executive Bureau and of the Constitutional Commission. Resigned from the People's party in August 1930 to join the new Liberal Republican party founded by Fethi Bey. Was not re-elected at the General Election of April, 1931, and in October was appointed professor (history of law) in the University of Constantinople, whither he removed with his family from Angora.

Ahmet Bey is a short man with heavy eyebrows and dark glasses. He recalls the storied one-eyed mule of hideous aspect, but that aspect is benignant, and in his riper years tends to belie the lurid record of his youth. He was the "character" of the Grand National Assembly, and loves nothing so well as a joke, even at his own expense. He was seen occasionally in Angora society, accompanied by his blue-stocking, English-speaking daughters, who are no more attractive in appearance than their father. Speaks Russian, French, Persian and Turkish. Since the summer of 1926 his articles have become less hostile to Great Britain, and in conversation he delights to expatiate on the charm of English life, particularly as led at Oxford.

Ahmet Muhtar Bey.

Born at Constantinople in 1871. Studied at French school and military college in Constantinople. In 1891 received a post in the Consular Department of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs; in due course became its Sub-Director-General. In 1909 consul-general at Budapest. In 1912 Minister at Athens. Joined the Committee of Union and Progress, and in 1913 was for a short time Minister for Foreign Affairs. In 1917 Minister at Kiev. Returned to Turkey in March 1919. Became Deputy for Constantinople. Escaped to Anatolia in June 1920 and joined the Nationalist movement. In June 1923 elected Deputy for Constantinople, and in the same year appointed Ambassador at Moscow. In October 1924 he opted for his deputyship and returned to Turkey. From 1923 till 1927 was secretary of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Assembly. In June 1927 his appointment as Ambassador to Washington was announced, and in November he took up his duties.

Ahmet Muhtar Bey is a man of the world, and his long official career has given him at least all the outward characteristics of a diplomat. He strikes one, however, as being somewhat sinister, though he is very agreeable in conversation. Speaks French fluently. Is credited with strong Russian sympathies.

Ali Bey.

Born about 1875 at Afyon Karahisar. Educated at the Constantinople Military School. Commanded a battalion at Çatalca during the Balkan war, and served in the Great War as a colonel. Organised resistance to the Greeks at Ayvalik in 1919. Was elected a Deputy for Constantinople in December, and remained there to attend the debates till March 1920, when he was deported to Malta. Released a year later, he at once took his seat in the Angora Assembly. After his re-election in 1923 he became one of the chief organisers of the People's party, and in November 1924 was elected vice-president of the administrative council of the party, a position which he still fills. In March 1925 he was appointed president of the Angora Independence Tribunal; soon afterwards shot with impunity a fellow Deputy in the Chamber, and unconcernedly passed death sentences till the Independence Tribunals were abolished early in 1927. 1925–27 was president of the Defence Commission of the Assembly, and in November 1927, on his re-election as Deputy for Afyon Karahisar, became a member of the Budget Commission. Is President of the Grand National Assembly group of the People's party.

Ali Bey, known as the "bald-headed," is a curious phenomenon, for, in spite of his record, he is attractive. Until recently only spoke Turkish, but for the last two years has devoted an hour daily to the study of English, which he now speaks haltingly, but reads with a certain facility. He has an engaging smile, and was once very aptly described by a British visitor to Angora as resembling "a benevolent Scotch elder." During the summer of 1927 rumour was busy with his name as a possible successor to Ismet Pasha. It is doubtful if he could have filled the bill, though his surprising honesty could not have failed to be an asset. Previously much in evidence at the Angora Club, he now rarely puts in an appearance. He is not a conversationalist.

Ali Cenani Bey.

Born about 1880 at Ayintap, which he represented in the Constantinople Parliament, being for a time reporter for the budget. Was deported to Malta in 1919 on a charge of complicity in the massacres of Armenians at Ayintap. On being released he joined the Kemalist movement, and has been Deputy for Ayintap since 1921. In November 1924 became Minister of Commerce. In 1925 his commercial legislation showed that he was leading the ultra-Nationalist movement against Christian employees and foreign capital. In May 1926 he resigned, owing to reported differences with the Minister of Finance. He nevertheless continued to be influential, and for two years was the chief Turkish delegate for commercial negotiations with foreign countries, being responsible in particular for the Turco-Russian Commercial Treaty of March 1927. Became reporter of the Budget Commission in November 1927, but fell from grace early in 1928, when he was tried by the High Court for a misuse of public funds while Minister of Commerce. Was heavily fined, but his sentence of imprisonment

was commuted. After reappearing in influential circles, left Turkey for Damascus in mysterious circumstances in December 1929. Though reported to owe £T. 100,000 to the Turkish Government, he once more reappeared at Angora, where his past seemed in a fair way to being forgotten, but he was not re-elected at the general election of April 1931.

Ali Cenani Bey was for long the leading business man in the Ayintap area, and in business circles was considered honest and go-ahead. Much of his property is now in Syria, and he has frittered away most of his considerable wealth. He is a poor speaker, of jaundiced appearance, and has been described as active, resourceful and wily. He plays a vigorous, but not very good, game of bridge. His two daughters have received an American college education, but his wife is rarely seen. His son is at the English High School in Constantinople.

Ali Sait Pasha.

Born near Bandirma in 1874, of Circassian origin. Graduated from the Military College in 1898, and held several minor staff appointments till 1907, when, with the rank of major, he was sent to the Yemen. Returned to Constantinople in 1909, and in 1913, during the Balkan war, was in charge of the lines of communication. Was then for a time control officer on the Anatolian Railway until January 1914, when he was promoted colonel and posted to Sanaa, in the Yemen, where he remained until some time after the 1918 armistice, when he was finally induced to surrender to the British authorities at Aden, whom he had fought for four years, during most of which he was out of touch with his Government. Interned in Egypt for a short time, Ali Sait Pasha, who had now been promoted general, returned to Constantinople early in 1919 and was Military Governor of the capital till March 1920, when, on the occupation of the town, he was deported to Malta. Immediately after his release in October 1921 he joined Mustafa Kemal, and in the following year he succeeded Kâzim Karabekir Pasha as General Officer Commanding the Eastern Army. In October 1924 he was appointed Inspector-General of the First Army Area, and still holds this post. Was promoted to be a general of the first class in August 1927.

Ali Sait Pasha is pleasant, courteous and has a well-modulated voice. Was probably at one time decidedly pro-British, and still is, as he says, "in the interests of his country," but he chooses to forget rather than to forgive his treatment at British hands. Not a strong personality and takes no part in politics, but is interested in Iraq oil to such an extent that on an Angora ball-room floor he produced to a member of the Embassy a largish map, on which the position of his wells was clearly shown. Speaks a little English, a consequence of Malta, where he also learnt to play tennis. Both he and his massive wife used to be very popular in Angora society, but, when the attendance of military officers at social functions was vetoed in March 1928, they transferred their domicile to Constantinople, and their appearances in the capital are now all too infrequent.

Asim Pasha.

Born about 1882 in Constantinople. Passed out of Military College in 1902 with rank of staff captain, and was attached to the Imperial Guard. From 1907 to 1909 served on staff of Bitolj (Monastir) division. In 1909 appointed to General Staff. Pursued a course of military studies in Germany from 1912 till January 1915, when on his return he was attached to Turkish General Headquarters, remaining there till end of war. Again in Germany 1918–19. In November 1920 became chief of the Intelligence Section of the General Staff, but soon after threw in his lot with the Nationalists and became Chief of Staff to Fevzi Pasha. In November 1924 became General Officer Commanding the IXth Army Corps, in August 1926 was promoted Divisional General and later commanded the 5th Corps. In October 1928 was appointed sub-chief of the Turkish General Staff.

Asim Pasha is a tall, dark man of slight build and has a very pleasant manner. He has the reputation of being hard-working, strict, accurate and given to great financial economy. He got on well with his German superiors during the war, speaks German well, and knows some French.

Behiç Bey

Born about 1880. An ex colonel. In 1924 was chief administrator of the Anatolian Railway, a post in which he showed considerable ability and energy. In December 1925 became a Deputy for Constantinople and a month later Minister of Public Works. As a Minister he was a pronounced success, and showed great capacity in organising the existing railways and in dealing with the somewhat grandiose construction schemes of the Government. Resigned October 1928, nominally on grounds of ill health, and was immediately afterwards appointed Minister at Budapest.

Cafer Tayar Pasha

Born in 1883 at Prishtina, of poor parents. Educated by the charity of an Albanian who sent him to the military school. Saw service in Macedonia and in 1907 became a member of the Committee of Union and Progress. Served at the Dardanelles and in 1918 had command of Turkish forces in Northern Caucasus. Early in the armistice he showed himself friendly and British and formed a military garrison at Aleppo with which in 1920 he resisted attempts to resist the occupation of the town by the Greek army. From then onwards was known as the Lion of Aleppo. In which year in 1920 he had also the honour of Deputy for Aleppo. In 1924 he headed the second Opposition party. In 1924 he commanded the troops in the Eastern Vilayets in the suppression of Mustafa Kemal's opponents and in October he resigned his military duties to take up the post of Deputy. In July 1926 along with Ali Fuat Rauf and Kazim Karabekir Pasha was arrested at Smyrna on a plot against the life of Mustafa Kemal. It was alleged that they were in touch with members of the anti-Kemalist party in the army. They were tried by the Court of Independence and sentenced to death. Was released in March 1927 and since then has lived in retirement at Vienna.

Cafer Tayar Pasha is a strong patriot, just and honest, and as a result of his Aleppo experiences is violently anti-Greek.

Celal Nuri Bey

Born about 1884. Was editor and manager of a Young Turk newspaper in Constantinople in 1909. Expelled shortly after and only returned after the Constitution when he again published his paper. Later was allowed to appear until 1925. Was absent from the country during the war. In the early armistice months his paper was Kemalist organ, until he was deported to Malta in March 1920. Shortly before the last election elected Deputy for Gallipoli. Was released in March 1921 and after a visit to Angora took his seat in the Angora Assembly. Has since been a member of the Constitutional Commission of the Assembly in 1922 being President, reporter in 1923 and secretary in 1930. During the constitutional crisis in March 1921 was a warm supporter of the proposal to accord dissolution, and vote powers to the President of the Republic, but the proposal was defeated. In September 1927 was elected Deputy for Izmir (Smyrna) and in November while still retaining membership of the Constitutional Commission became reporter of the Budget Commission of the Assembly. Re-elected Deputy for Tekirdag in April 1931. Formerly the Yeniçag newspaper but dissolution proceedings for it were at once begun, attacking the Government in June 1931 and was subsequently closed down.

Celal Nuri Bey is something of an intellectual, clever and an intriguer. He is supposed to have Communist leanings, but was for some time chiefly active in anti-Greek campaign normally on behalf of Turkish non-exchangeables.

Cemal Husnu Bey

Born about 1887. An ex officer. Has been Deputy for Gumushane 1925-30. 1927-28 was reporter of Assembly Commerce Commission and is now a member of the Foreign Affairs Commission. In March 1925 became chief Turkish delegate for the exchange of populations and in November of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Assembly. Appointed Minister of Education in April 1929 and Minister at Berne in September 1930 when he resigned his Deputyship.

Cemal Husnu Bey is pleasant to talk to, speaks fair French and plays a fair game of bridge. He is however very inept in several occasions nearly torpedoed the Greco-Turkish negotiations.

Cemil Bey

Born about 1885. Has followed a military career. About 1906 was commandant of the garrison at Smyrna and at that time saved Mustafa Kemal from arrest by Abdulhamit's secret police. During the armistice, when he held the rank of staff lieutenant-colonel, was in command of the defence forces against the Greeks at Cassaba. In July 1923 elected Deputy for Tekirdag (Rodosto). In May 1924 appointed general secretary of the People's party, and in January 1925 became Minister of the Interior. Though for a time he did well and exercised considerable influence his position became weakened early in 1927 owing to allegations in connexion with Government contracts, and though re-elected Deputy in September he ceased to hold ministerial rank on the reconstruction of Ismet Pasha's Cabinet in November 1927. In the same month he became a member of the Foreign Affairs Commission. Re-elected Deputy for Erzerum in June 1931. Is one of the two vice-presidents of the People's party and President of the Local Affairs Commission.

Cemil Bey is reserved and intelligent, and speaks only a little French.

Cemal Bey Professor

Born about 1880. Has followed a legal career and specialises in international law, on which he is now the recognised Turkish authority. Was chief adviser to the Turkish delegation before the Hague Tribunal in 1927 in connexion with the Lotus incident in which judgment was given in favour of Turkey. From 1922 to 1924 was one of the chief movers in a Turkish association for the League of Nations which in October 1924 attended the eighth session of League of Nations Society in London. In 1931 was appointed member of the Permanent Conciliation Commission formed in accordance with the Athens-Angora Treaty of Friendship of 1930. Was also appointed member of The Hague Permanent Court of Arbitration.

Cemal Bey is somewhat reserved and lives entirely absorbed in his studies. His family have created a beautiful garden in which he is keen gardener. Somewhat Turkish in appearance.

Cevat Pasha

Born Constantinople in 1873. Educated at the Galata Saray School and at the military school. In 1893 aide-de-camp to the Sultan. Later sent to Germany to complete his military studies and on his return secured rapid promotion owing to his favourable influence at the palace. In 1913 appointed General Officer Commanding the Dardanelles Defences, and was in command of the Palestine army at the time of the Turkish collapse in 1918. In November 1918 became Chief of General Staff and in December was Minister for War. Obstructed the Allies during the early armistice and from the first was one of the strongest and ablest of the Nationalist supporters in Constantinople. From October 1919 to February 1920 was again Chief of the General Staff. In March 1920 was arrested and deported to Malta. Released in October 1921 he at once proceeded to Angora and in January 1922 was given the command of the Turkish troops on the Iraq frontier. Elected Deputy in July 1923 he took no part in the proceedings of the Assembly having in the meantime been appointed military inspector-general of the eastern provinces. In October 1924 was in supreme command of the Turkish forces on the Iraq frontier when the *status quo* boundary was fixed. Later in the month he resigned from his military duties in order to take up his Deputyship. Resigned from the latter two months later. In January 1925 was attached to the Iraq Frontier Commission in the capacity of assessor and showed himself petulant and unreasonable. In September and December was attached to the Turkish Mosul delegation to Geneva. In April 1928 became a member of the Supreme Military Council and in August was promoted to the rank of general of the first class. In November 1930 went to Geneva as military adviser to Turkish delegation to Preparatory Disarmament Conference.

Cevat Pasha knows French and German well. Is very Germanophil and something of an opportunist. His good military reputation is well deserved and he is a capable administrator. He is addicted to strong drinks, likes Havana cigars, his prayers, but is stated to be a close friend of Mustafa Kemal Pasha who served under him at the Dardanelles.

Cevat Abbas Bey

Born about 1890. Early in 1919 became aide-de-camp to Mustafa Kemal and at the same time was elected Deputy for Bolu. Had control over the activities of the Nationalist secret agents throughout 1920. In July 1921 went on a mission to Bulgaria with a view to organising trouble in Thrace and in December became unofficial Kemalist representative at Sofia. Returned to Angora early in 1922 and in the autumn was one of the instigators of the Turkish insurrectionist movement in Western Thrace directed against Greek rule. In 1923 was re-elected Deputy for Bolu and at the end of the year there was much talk and intrigue in regard to his proposed retention as Turkish Minister at Sofia. In 1924 was president of the Turkish Aeroplane Association in the interest of which he showed great activity. Was re-elected Deputy in September 1927 and April 1931 and since November 1927 has been a member of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Assembly. In December 1931 became deputy chairman of board of directors of Turkish company exploiting notorious drug factory at Kuzguncuk on the Bosphorus. Maintains close contact with the President of the Republic.

Edip Servet Bey (Değirmenoğlu)

Born at Constantinople in 1879. Son of Servet Pasha. Left the Military College in 1898. Served with the Sofia army and in Thrace till he entered the Staff College in 1909. In 1911 was attached to the Yanina Regiment, and in 1913 private secretary. Held a staff appointment during the Balkan war and was one of the military staff of the Turkish delegates to the 1913 Peace Conference in London. Later in the year was for a few months chief A.D.C. to Enver Pasha. Served throughout the Great War at the Dardanelles, in the Caucasus and in Palestine and in 1917 was director of the Military Press Bureau. In March 1918 was a member of the Turkish mission sent to Roumania to discuss peace. During the armistice was a member of the Armistice Commission and director of Prisoners of War Section and joined Mustafa Kemal in June 1920. Was utterly ostracised by engaged in arranging the supply of munitions and in 1922 was for a time member of the Turco-Syrian Frontier Administrative Commission. In November became Military Commandant of Constantinople and Acting Governor of Pera. In November 1925 became Deputy for Constantinople and in 1926 he represented Turkey at the Islamic Congress at Mecca, and made history by appearing in a bowler hat. In 1927 was a member of the Foreign Affairs Commission and is now a member of that for Economic Affairs. Elected Deputy for Gumushane May 1931. Is a leading member of the Board of Directors of the Is Bankasi and Balya Karaaydin Company and is the Grand Master of the Angora Lodge of Freemasons.

Edip Bey is short, stout and jovial with a face like the rising sun. On the rare occasions when, in the early hours, it has approached its zenith, he shows a taste for operatic old Turk shouts, and has a good voice. Though not involved so deeply in politics as are his colleagues, he is in great favour with the Gazi, and is influential being an intimate friend of Saffet Bey. While not appearing bright he is shrewd and sharp and probably has more hard thinking than any of the others. Speaks French, Italian, Russian and German. Is hospitable with a native courtesy of manner and a passion for doing things right and urging his friends to do likewise. Is perhaps the most popular Turk in Angora.

Enis Bey Mehmet

Born about 1887. From 1907 until the Great War was an official of the Ministry of Interior. Became vice-consul at Aleppo during the war and in 1925 was counsellor at Moscow. In 1926 became Director General of Political Affairs at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs. In October was given the rank of Minister and in November 1927 became Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs. Appointed Minister at Athens in 1929.

Enis Bey is pleasant and capable. In spite of rather different hours, he for some time captured the entire murder of the Foreign Ministry and was universally liked with whom he came in contact with him. Is strong, forward and honest. The organisation of the Foreign Ministry out of complete chaos was due almost entirely to him and his departure was generally regretted by the foreign diplomats in Angora. His wife is attractive.

Ercument Ekrem Bey

Born about 1888, the son of Reşat Ercument Bey, the Turkish poet. Appointed secretary at the Turkish Legation at Athens. Was recalled by Abdulhamit on suspicion of intriguing with classical elements. Later appointed to Bucharest. Was Mayor of Pera during the armistice. In 1923-24 was Director of Press in Angora. In March 1924 became private secretary to President of Republic, but fell out of the President's wife and in April became Assistant Prefect of Constantinople. Was dismissed in August, and remained unemployed till September 1927 when he again became Director of Press at Angora until the spring of the present year, 1931. Appointed (July 1931) consul at Warsaw but is still in charge of Affaires.

Ercument Ekrem Bey is a short, stout man of a disagreeable type. He is certainly clever, but not at all to be trusted. Speaks fair English.

Esat Bey

Born in Verria (Macedonia) in 1874. Educated in the Harbiye School and graduated in 1894. Gazetted to the 4th Army (Syria). In 1898 entered the Harbiye (Military College) where he occupied different tutorial posts for twelve years. After the proclamation of the Constitution he proceeded to Germany in order to complete his studies. In the course of the Balkan War he was commander of the 53rd Regiment and during the Great War in command of the 20th Division. He was persuaded not to resign his post when he was second and president of the military section Hall of the Forest. Became afterwards president of the administrative council at a commercial venture the Orhu Dokuma Pazar A.V.E. and N. Stoss, a large and influential shareholder of the telephone company, member of the Constantinople Municipal Assembly, and was elected Deputy for Brussa three years ago. He knows three foreign languages and has occupied himself for many years with the study of philology. Appointed Minister of Education in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet September 1930 and retained the post in Ismet Pasha's new Cabinet May 1931.

Fahrettin Pasha

Born at Constantinople in 1881. Educated at the Military School where he was a class mate of Enver Pasha. 1909 in command of troops against the Kurds, near Dersim. Later became an active Committee of Union and Progress adherent, and in 1910 chief aide-de-camp to the War Office. Held various staff appointments before becoming Under Secretary for War in 1915. In 1916 commanded the Turkish division in Galicia, and in 1918 served on the Palestine front. In 1920 was recalled in connection with the Imperial troops at Konya. Joined the Nationalist cause in the summer of that year. Later in 1920 secured the command of the XIIth Army Corps which he retained until the final success of the Turks over the Greeks. In 1923 was elected Deputy for Smyrna and became commander of the Vth Army Corps. In October 1924 resigned his deputyship on opting for military duties. In November 1924 on the resignation of Ali Fuat Pasha became one of the three military inspectors general and in August 1926 was promoted divisional general of the first class, but holding a higher rank than any of the Opposition Pashas. Was attached to the King of Afghanistan during the latter's visit to Angora in May 1928. On the 1st January 1931, was appointed Military Commander of the district (Manisa and Balikesri), placed under martial law in consequence of the reactionary incident at Menemen.

Fahrettin Pasha is a tall well built man and a good type. He has been described as a rough diamond but is honest and, next to Fevzi Pasha, probably carries most weight in Turkish military circles.

Falik Rifki Bey

Born in 1894 at Constantinople and educated at Galata Saray College where he was after a teacher. Was secretary to Cemal Pasha in Syria during the war after which he took up journalism and for a time wrote articles for the Unionist Yeni Gun and for Mustafa Kemal and wrote for the Nationalist press. Since 1923 has been Deputy for Bolu and in the 1923-27 Assembly was secretary of the Foreign Affairs Commission. In the summer of 1927 he went to Rio de Janeiro as chief Turkish delegate at

the International Parliamentary Congress and returned deeply impressed by the advantages to be derived from an Anglo Saxon, as opposed to a Latin, education Throughout 1928 he continued to be in great favour, and in May was one of the Turkish delegates to the International Press Congress at Cologne On his return he became president of the Commission for the Reform of the Turkish Alphabet, and, after the Gazi has probably done more than anyone else to secure the general adoption of the new script He owns the concession for the Hakimiyeti Milliye and was a former director of the Anatolian agency In September 1930 visited Moscow in the company of the Minister for Foreign Affairs and in April 1931 went to Abastumani on mission connected with Balkan Union

Fahib Rifki Bey is at the same time the youngest and the wildest of the President's associates He is frank has a fair knowledge of French, and is an ardent Westerner Has tremendous driving power but is a heavy drinker, and his and other excesses are unfortunately already beginning to tell their tale An excellent bridge player Wife young not without intelligence is a distinguished and lively hostess in Constantinople

Ferid Bey, Ahmet

Born at Smyrna 1875 Passed through Harbiye Military College in 1898 with rank of captain Later went to Paris and studied at School of Political Science Only returned to Turkey after 1908 Joined the Committee of Union and Progress and became Deputy for Kutahya In 1910 joined the Liberal Party and was exiled with the Committee of Union and Progress in 1913, whose views he never has since withdrawn He made his peace with Talat Pasha in 1917 and became consul general at Sofia in November 1917 Resided in Bulgaria Delegate to Lausanne Conference on Committee of Union and Progress In 1919 was Minister of Public Works and of Finance under Damad Ferid Pasha He resigned in July owing to his lack of co-operation and friendship with Mustafa Kemal Elected for Nationalist cause in April 1920 was noted as a vehement opponent of the Angora Assembly and soon afterwards became Minister of Interior In September 1920 attended the Baku Congress and soon afterwards appointed Director Bolshevik Department Nov 1921 was appointed representative of the Angora Government at Paris with post to hold till February 1923 when he was recalled because of certain offensive remarks made regarding the Allies In spite of opposition in the Assembly, he became Minister of the Interior in October 1923 Was the subject of many attacks both in the Assembly and the press and continued to hold the post till May 1924 Appointed Ambassador at London in June 1925 Was summoned to Angora in December 1930 with his colleagues at Paris and Berlin, to consult with the Government and the Gazi on the international general situation when it was rumoured that he would be given the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in place of Saraoglu Sukru Bey This however did not materialise

Ferid Bey speaks good French and Arabic A thorough opportunist and rather unscrupulous Wife is attractive and has helped him to make something of a success of the London Embassy

Fethi Bey, Ali

Born at Ohrid, Macedonia in 1877 Graduated from military school in Constantinople in 1903 and saw service in Macedonia Became an ardent Committee of Union and Progress adherent and took charge of Ahmed Anni on the expulsion of the latter to Salonika 1910 13, military attache at Sofia, and 1913 17 Minister there Was for a short time Minister of the Interior in autumn of 1918 and soon after was deported to Malta for political reasons Released in April 1921 he proceeded at once to Anatolia and became Minister of the Interior in July August 1922 proceeded later to Lausanne to Paris and London In 1923 elected Deputy for Constantinople and during two months was President Executive of Ministers, which post he resigned on emergence of Republican issue In November became first President of the Assembly In March 1924 was regarded as being identified with the Opposition when the question of the President's powers was under consideration In May chief Turkish delegate for Moscow Embassy in Constantinople Represented Turkey before the League of Nations Secretariat and later proceeded to Brussels again in connexion with

the Mosul question Became President of the Council for the second time and in November also held the portfolio of Defence His period of office was marked by moderation, and he had the support of the Oppositionist Progressive party In March 1925 on the outbreak of the Kurdish revolt His Government fell because of his alleged lukewarmness in dealing with the rebels and in the same month he was appointed Turkish Ambassador in Paris Resigned his post in August 1930 when he reappeared in Turkey as the founder of a new political party the Liberal Republican with the full approval of the Gazi probably even by his order To facilitate his entry into the Assembly, was returned unopposed as Deputy for Gumushane Was obliged by failure of presidential support, to dissolve his party in November but retained the Gazi's friendship, and they were much together during the annual festivities at Angora October November 1931

Fethi Bey has Mongol features He is pleasant to talk to, speaks good French and is essentially a moderate He has an attractive English speaking wife and his daughter is being educated at the English High School for Girls Constantinople There is every belief that even from Paris he exercised no little influence at Angora and any visit which he paid to the capital in 1928 had much to do with the Turkish acceptance of Ottoman debt settlement

Fevzi Pasha, Mustafa, Field Marshal

Born in Constantinople in 1874 Graduated from Military College in 1895 Saw service in Macedonia From then until 1913 held numerous staff appointments During the war fought at Gallipoli in the Caucasus and in Palestine and was Chief of the General Staff, 1918 19 In November 1919 was sent on a mission to Anatolia by the Constantinople Government and established relations with Mustafa Kemal Held the portfolio of War in Constantinople Government during February and March 1920 He was throughout in close touch with Mustafa Kemal and on his resignation he went to Anatolia and was at once appointed Minister for National Defence Played a large part in building up the Kemalist army and in organising transport and the production of ammunition In 1921 he became for a time Commander in Chief, later re-established this position and became Chief of Staff In 1923 was elected deputy for Constantinople and was subsequently re-appointed Chief of Staff Resigned his Deputyship in October 1924 on spring for military duties In the autumn of 1927 was suffering from diabetes and went to Europe for a cure Since then his health has much improved

Fevzi Pasha had the confidence of Enver Pasha during the Great War, and is now understood to have that of Mustafa Kemal Reported to be a capable officer, especially in matters relating to administration Regarded by Halide Hanim as a good soldier but nothing more Has considerable influence with the army Was in his future plans Turkish as well as pan Islamic, and the abolition of the Caliphate was regarded as the only rival of Mustafa Kemal Pasha of whose murder of late he was understood strongly to disapprove Was regarded as the leader of the war party at Angora during the Mosul crisis Used to be regarded as old fashioned and kept his womenfolk secluded but he is now seen more in public Speaks a little French and is pleasant to talk to

Hakki Sinasi Pasha

Born at Constantinople in 1868, the son of a Foreign Ministry official Studied first at the naval, and afterwards at the medical, school Followed medical courses at Berlin, Heidelberg and Munich While a doctor at the Hamidiye Hospital in 1904 was expelled to Anatolia On his return in 1908 was reinstated with rank of colonel, and later promoted general Retired in 1918, and from then till 1921 occupied himself with municipal affairs In November 1924 became a Deputy for Constantinople and was in 1927 28 Chairman of the Public Health Commission of the Assembly In September 1925 was Turkish Red Crescent delegate at the International Red Cross Conference at Geneva In March 1928 became chief inspector of the People's party for Constantinople and in the late summer negotiated successfully in a Constantinople tramway strike Elected a Deputy for Erzerum in April 1931

Hamdi Bey, Mehmet

Born about 1880. During the armistice was head of the Refugee Section of the Ministry of Interior at Constantinople. In 1923 was elected Deputy for Erzincan. In 1924 was assistant Turkish delegate for the exchange of Turco-Greek populations and in 1923 became chief delegate on the appointment of Tevfik Rustu Bey as Minister for Foreign Affairs. Negotiated the Turco-Greek Agreement of 1925, and in June was appointed Minister at Vienna. Short and stoutish. Hamdi Bey speaks French fairly well and is intelligent and moderate.

Hamidi Suphi Bey

Born at Constantinople in 1881. Educated at Galata Saray College. In 1901 entered Ministry for Foreign Affairs as a clerk. Remained there till 1908, occupying himself in writing poetry. After the Constitution continued his literary efforts, and was the founder of a society of young poets which developed into the Turkish Ojaks. In 1910 appointed Professor of Turkish literature at the Constantinople University. Was for a time a prominent member of the Committee of Union and Progress but after the Balkan war was on good terms with the Unionists. Later became the leading propagandist of pan-Turanianism. Travelled in Germany during the war. In the early months of 1919 was in British custody in Malta. In April 1920 joined Mustafa Kemal at Angora. Later in the year was for some time head of the Kemalist Intelligence Service abroad. April 1921 Minister of Public Instruction. In April became Vice President of the Assembly. Occupied himself chiefly with the pan-Islamic Congress held in Angora. Was again Minister of Public Instruction during the latter half of 1921 and was one of the first of the Angora leaders to have opened a contact with the Soviet. In 1923 was elected Deputy for Constantinople and later president of the Turkish Oaks to which he devoted most of his new-found leisure. During 1923 was president of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Assembly and from March till December 1925 was again Minister of Public Instruction, resigning owing to ill-health. September 1927 re-elected for Constantinople, was a member of the Constantinople Commission of the Assembly. In October 1930 went to Athens as a member of the Turkish delegation to the Balkan conference. Early in 1931 the Turkish Oaks organisation was purged in that the Pop Republican Party took over its great wealth and Hamidi Suphi was not given re-elected Deputy but was appointed Minister at Bucharest.

Hamidi Suphi Bey is an idealist of the pan-Turanian school and was the moving spirit of the Turkish Oaks until their suppression. He is a keen nationalist. Is not possessed of means and his honesty is above reproach. Is strongly anti-Russian: one of his sons is at the English High School for Boys at Constantinople.

Hasan Bey

Born in Trebizond in 1884, said to be of Lazo origin. Educated at Constantinople and in Paris where, from 1909-14 he studied at the School of Political Science. During the war was head of the Economic Section of the Food Supplies Directorate and in December 1919 became Deputy for Erzurum. Joined the Kemalist movement in March 1920, and in May 1921 became Minister of Finance, holding the post until April 1922. By this time he was apparently very pro-Bolshevist in sympathy. From May till June 1922 Minister of Economics and Public Works. In November was appointed member of the Turkish delegation to the Lausanne Conference when he acted as financial expert. September 1923, was again Minister of Economics. In March 1924 Minister of Commerce and in March 1925 again Minister of Finance, resigning in July 1926, ostensibly on grounds of ill-health. Continued however to play an important part in Turkish political matters. Was re-elected Deputy in September 1927 and in November when it was announced that he was to relieve the Ministry he became first Vice President of the Assembly. Was President of the Turkish delegation to the Balkan Congress at Athens October 1930. In May 1931 went with the Minister for Foreign Affairs to Geneva to attend the European Union Conference and while there attended also the International Conference for the Limitation of Dangerous Drugs. In October was president of the second Balkan Conference held at Constantinople.

Hasan Bey fancies himself as an expert in matters pertaining to finance. Knows French fairly well, is a man of private means, wily, and has a sense of humour. Not attractive personality. Probably a bully, has been described as something of an "apache," and most nearly answers the description when playing bridge, which he does very well. Has a young and attractive little wife.

Hasan Fehmi Bey

Born at Gumusane in 1877. Educated at Constantinople, and from 1902 to 1910 held various posts in the Turkish Civil Service. In 1910, Governor of Gireson (Kerasund) and in 1912 of Kossotini (Gumulcina). 1913-18 Deputy for Gumusane. Fuad Mustafa Kemal in April 1919. In 1920 Vice President of the Assembly. In April 1922 was Minister of Finance. In 1923 elected Deputy for Gumusane. August 1923 to February 1924 again Minister of Finance resigning because of a dispute over the Anatolian Railway question. November 1924 till March 1925, Minister of Agriculture. December 1925, became one of the Government delegates on the board of the Ottoman Bank. Was re-elected Deputy in September 1927. In November of that year became chairman of the Finance Commission and in November 1928 a member of the Constitutional Commission. Re-elected Deputy for Gumusane in April 1931 and elected chairman of the Budget Commission in May.

Hasan Fehmi Bey is not reckoned as a strong man, and during his occupation of ministerial posts was little more than an echo of Mustafa Kemal.

Haydar Bey

Born at Philippopolis about 1885. Having completed his studies at Galata Saray College he entered the Ministry for Foreign Affairs and remained there till 1911 when he became second secretary at Sofia. Attended the London Peace Conference in 1913 and later remained at Sofia until February 1919, when he returned to the Ministry. Since December 1919 was Director of Press and in May 1921 became private secretary to the Minister for Foreign Affairs, retaining the post until the fall of the Constantinople Government in November 1922. Was appointed Turkish plenipotentiary to London in February 1921 and March 1922. Early in 1924 was a Turkish delegate for exchange of populations and in August became first secretary at Berlin. In August 1927 was appointed Chargé d'Affaires at Stockholm, Oslo and Copenhagen. In November 1928 was appointed Minister at Belgrade and in the autumn of 1931 acted as Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs in the place of Numan Bey.

Haydar Bey is something of an intriguer and rather an opportunist having tacked fairly successfully to the varying winds which have blown in Turkey during the last generation. He is however, amiable and good mannered as well as able and intelligent. Strongly favours a close Bulgaro-Turkish friendship.

Hikmet Bey Yusuf

Born in Constantinople about 1882. Educated at the Galata Saray College. Entered the Turkish Diplomatic Service and served as a secretary at Paris and Berlin. Returned to the Sublime Porte early in the armistice, but in 1920 went to Angora where he at once became Political Director at the Foreign Ministry and accompanied the Nationalist mission to Europe in 1922. In 1924 was counsellor in London and in January 1925 again became head of the Political section of the Foreign Ministry. In the summer of 1925 he became Minister at Belgrade holding the post till November 1927 when he became private secretary to the President of the Republic. In July 1928 was appointed Ambassador at Kabul where he has not been a success. But his position was made very difficult by the collapse of Amanullah and the consequent eclipse of Turkish influence. In 1930-31 went on tour in India and on his return treated His Majesty's Minister at Kabul to caustic reversions on the laxity of British rule in that country.

Yusuf Hikmet Bey is short, dark, and somewhat insignificant in appearance. He is however intelligent. He has agreeable manners and, in spite of slight deafness was generally popular in Belgrade where His Majesty's Minister found him pleasant to deal with. He might, nevertheless turn out to be something of a mischief-maker. Is said to be a voracious reader and collector of news, without however the capacity of digesting or even appraising his material.

Hilmi Bey

Early history unknown. Appointed Vali of Adana in 1925 and was soon afterwards tried by the Angora Independence Tribunal for failure to send certain witnesses from Adana to the capital. Later became local Popular Party Inspector. In September 1927 was elected Deputy for Adana in October became a member of the executive branch of the Popular Party and in November a member of the Internal Affairs Commission of the Assembly. Elected Vice President of this Commission in 1928 reporter in 1929 and again Vice President in November 1930. In December 1930 succeeded Zekai Bey as Minister of Public Works and retained his portfolio in Ismet Pasha's new Cabinet, May 1931.

Hulusi Behcet Bey

Born 1889 at Constantinople. Member of the Turkish Diplomatic Service. Was employed at Berlin and Vienna during the war and at Christiania in 1923, where he received an appointment in the Ministry for Foreign Affairs at Angora. May 1924 became chief secretary to Adnan Bey delegate at Constantinople of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. In October went to Geneva as member of the Turkish delegation to the Congress of the League of Nations Societies. Resigned in March 1925 on reasons unknown though it was suggested that it was due to his sympathies with Angora. In May appointed Chargé d'Affaires at Sofia. In September 1925 was transferred to Sofia as Envoy to Norway, where he was called to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in August 1931 to become Director of the VIth Department.

His first Envoy's post was to Sofia. Behcet Bey is married and his wife writes and paints with success. Both speak French and German. Behcet Bey is a pleasant fellow with a moustache. Proposed to have a good cigar but was very clever and believed to be fairly straight. Knows English and speaks excellent French.

Hasgüel Cahit Bey

Born at Constantinople in 1876. Took up the teaching profession but in 1908 went over to parliamentary and became till 1912 editor and part proprietor of the "Tanin," the official organ of the Committee of Union and Progress. From 1908 was one of the Constantinople Deputies in the Chamber at which he became one of the vice presidents during the war. Before the war was representative of the Turkish bondholders on the Public Debt. Played no great political part during the war but at the armistice was arrested and deported to Malta. Released in April 1921 he spent the following year in Europe. On his return to Constantinople he resumed publication of the "Tanin" and for a time supported the Kemalist régime. Nevertheless he kept in close touch with the surviving Committee of Union and Progress leaders and gradually began to take a more independent line in his writings. By 1923 the "Tanin" had become the chief organ of the Opposition and in December Cahit Bey was tried and acquitted for the publication of the Ali Kemal letter. In April 1925 he was again arrested for his publications, the "Tanin" was suppressed and Cahit Bey was sentenced by the Independence Tribunal to a life time's retirement at a fortress (Corum). He was again brought before the tribunal in August 1926 for alleged participation in the Smyrna plot but was acquitted and soon afterwards released. In 1930 became chairman of the Board of Directors of the Bank of Industries and Mines.

Tall and slight. Cahit Bey was remarkable for his caustic satire and was feared by his enemies. Has written several poems and produced a number of scholastic books. His former power was doubtless derived partly from his association with Djavit Bey and the Government seem to have brought him to terms.

Hassan Cavat Bey

Born at Constantinople in 1886. Educated at Galata Saray College. Also entered the Ministry for Foreign Affairs in 1898. Appointed to Vienna (1899) Athens (1901), Cetinje (1905) Petersburg (1907) London (1909), Minister at Cetinje (1911) and at Belgrade (1913). 1917-19 was Minister at Stockholm,

1920-22 at Berne. In 1923 was appointed by Angora to Bucharest. Transferred to Paris in November 1924, his speech on presenting his credentials in February 1925 was much criticised in the Assembly, and he was recalled. In April was appointed Minister at Athens. In December 1928 was appointed Ambassador at Tokyo, and in the autumn of 1931 Ambassador at Warsaw.

Huseyin Cavat Bey is fat, affable, and very popular. Believed to be honest and well intentioned. Is rich and married to a young wife. Believed to be Anglophil in sympathy, he knows French and German well, speaks English, plays golf and was responsible for its introduction into Montenegro.

Hüseyin Rüşdü Bey

Born about 1885 in Rhodes. A brother of Resit Galip Bey. In 1923 was appointed Turkish representative in Paris. Transferred to Bucharest in April 1925. Appointed Ambassador at Moscow in January 1929. Is of pleasant address, married, speaks good French and is well looked upon in the highest Angora circles.

Hüsrev Bey, Ridvanbeyoğlu

Born in 1884. A soldier *de carrière* was military attaché at Athens at the outbreak of the Great War and later served on the staff of the Caucasus army as an intelligence officer. During the early part of the Nationalist struggle was private secretary to Mustafa Kemal Pasha. In February 1921 was a member of Bekir Sami Bey's Mission to Paris, London and Rome. In July 1923 was elected Deputy for Urfa. In May 1924 became Minister at Budapest. Later resigned his deputyship on going for his legation. In August 1926 was appointed Minister at Sofia. In July 1930 was appointed Ambassador at Warsaw but did not proceed and the following month was appointed Ambassador at Tehran, where he has unfortunately upon occasion betrayed his disgust for all things Persian. In 1931 the Persian New Year arrangements were altered to prevent his making a speech as dean of the Diplomatic Corps.

Hüsrev Bey is tall and good looking and is a friend of the Gazi.

Ibrahim Tali Bey

Born about 1885. An ex-army doctor by profession and served in that capacity during the Great War. Came under the Gazi's notice at Diyarbekir in 1916 or 1917. Later became Turkish consul at Batum. In February 1924 it was rumoured that he would succeed Adnan Bey as representative of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs at Constantinople but instead he went to Salonica to investigate alleged abuses on the part of the Turkish consul there. In April was appointed Minister at Warsaw. January 1926 elected Deputy for Diyarbekir and returned to Angora in the following month. In May became inspector-general of the People's party in Constantinople and, as such, had very extensive powers. Took a prominent part in the 1927 elections and was himself again returned for Diyarbekir. In October became vice-president of the Executive Council of the People's party and in November a member of the Assembly's Foreign Affairs Commission. In December resigned his deputyship on being appointed inspector-general of the Eastern Provinces with extensive powers. His had considerable success at modernising the backward districts under his jurisdiction.

Ibrahim Tali Bey is a short bullet-headed man and wears heavy glasses. He speaks French and a little English and is cultured. Is pleasant in conversation, genial, tactful and broad minded. Has been to Bombay, studies Anglo-Indian administration and makes his officials start work at 7.30 and stop at 1.

Ihsan (Latif) Pasha

Born about 1875 at Constantinople. Left military college as a staff captain in 1896. 1900-06 military attaché at Athens. Joined the General Staff as lieutenant-colonel in 1906. From 1908 till 1911 he served on the staff of the VIIth Army being then appointed its chief. Later recalled to the Imperial General Staff was placed in command of Fifteenth Division in 1912, and in 1914 was transferred with rank of brigadier-general to the 34th Division at Erzerum. Was captured after the battle of Sarikamis in January 1915 and sent as a prisoner to Siberia, whence he escaped in December making his way on foot to China and from there returning by way of America to Constantinople. On his return he was placed on the retired list but later and took up the post of

mayor at Yenikov on the Bosphorus. Brought back after the armistice he became in 1919 a member of the Military Court of Constantinople in 1920 Inspector of Fraserers of War also in 1921 Director of the War Department. This brought him in close touch with the Angora government and in December as he was superintendent of their organisations in Constantinople. Though officially unemployed from November 1922, he was charged with the defence of Constantinople in the event of war between Turkey and the Allies. In July 1924 became Vali of Smyrna and 1 20 Deputy for Constantinople and since 1927 has been a member of the National Defence Commission of the Assembly. Elected Deputy for Canik in Kars Ilı April 1931

Ismet Inönü Pasha is a thick-set man with ape-like features. He is scrupulously clean in appearance. He is married and has an American-educated Turkish daughter. His wife is married to Dr. Adnan Bey, one of the best known physicians in Constantinople. He has published two books on the Lausanne Conference.

Fevzi Pasha

Born at Issik in Smyrna vilayet in 1876 (or 1879). He entered the military school in 1894 and graduated from the Staff College in 1903. He was attached to the Turkish Embassy in Berlin in 1909 and in 1913 14 was military attaché in Rome. In 1914 he was Chief of Staff to the Commander-in-Chief of the Yemen Army Corps and in 1915 16 Chief of Staff to the Commander-in-Chief of the Caucasus Army Corps. In 1917 he was Director of Military Operations at the War Department and in 1918 Chief of the General Staff. He was also Minister of War in the Ottoman Government which resigned on October 30th 1918. He was then arrested by the British and interned in Malta. He was released in December 1919 and returned to Constantinople. He was elected Deputy for Konia in the Ottoman Chamber of Deputies in 1920 and was appointed Minister of Foreign Affairs in the Nationalist Government in Angora on January 4th 1921. He was also appointed Commander-in-Chief of the Nationalist forces in the Greek War. He was elected President of the Grand National Assembly on April 24th 1921 and was appointed Prime Minister on August 5th 1921. He was appointed Minister of War on August 30th 1921. He was appointed Minister of Foreign Affairs on March 3rd 1922

Kâzım Karabekir Pasha

Born at Bitolia, Monastir, in 1878 of poor parents. Has throughout his life followed a military career. Held numerous staff appointments during the war. Immediately after the armistice was given command of the XV Army Corps at Erzerum where in May he established contact with Mustafa Kemal, definitely joining the latter in September. In 1919-20 was responsible for the consolidation of the Nationalist position in the eastern vilayets and for the repression of the Armenians. After the latter was disarmed, with Bolshevik agents. Was throughout in direct dependency of Angora and carried on relations with Moscow. Was elected deputy for Erzerum in September 1920 and in March 1921 was appointed Chief of the General Staff. Was given full powers there and for the eastern front in April 1921. Early in October 1922 he was appointed to the command of the Western Army Group to replace Mustafa Kemal, who had been appointed Chief of the General Staff. After the conclusion of peace with Greece he was appointed Commander of the Western Army Group, with headquarters at Balikesir, where he remained until September 1924, when he was appointed Chief of the General Staff. He resigned this post in October 1924 and was appointed Inspector of the Second Army, with headquarters at Erzerum. He resigned this post in March 1925 and was appointed Inspector of the Fifth Army, with headquarters at Diyarbekir. He resigned this post in February 1927 and was appointed Inspector of the Second Army, with headquarters at Erzerum. He resigned this post in March 1927

[illegible] School. Was employed for a time in analysis at Ministry of Natural Resources, returning to [illegible] studies, which he specialised in the subject of [illegible]. Subsequently became Under Secretary for Agriculture in 1926 and 1927. In the latter year was elected deputy for Mus and became the Budget Commissioner of the Assembly of which he was [illegible] in 1928. In 1931 was elected deputy for Kütahya and Secretary of the Budget Commission. In December 1934 was appointed to the newly created post of Minister of Agriculture.

Yunus Nadi Abalıoğlu

Born at Istanbul [illegible] Yenik[illegible] School [illegible] Military Academy and [illegible] Staff College. Attached to the Ottoman Embassy in Berlin as military attaché [illegible] Balkan Wars. Assistant military attaché at Bucharest [illegible] Balkan Wars. Appointed Chief Political Secretary to the Commission for the Delimitation of the Greek-Turkish Frontier in Thrace 1913. Accompanied the Turkish delegation to the Lausanne Conference 1922–23 as Secretary-General. Elected deputy for Izmir in the Grand National Assembly 1923. Minister of Public Works 1924–25. Minister of Finance 1925–27. Minister of Economy 1927–31. Minister of Public Works 1931–34. Minister of Agriculture 1934–[illegible].

Ali Kemal Pasha

[illegible] Istanbul [illegible] Military School [illegible] Military Academy. He took part in the Balkan Wars, during which he was attached to the staff of the Fifth Army. Subsequently he was appointed military attaché at Sofia, and was in charge of the Turkish military mission to Bulgaria during the World War. In October 1914 he was appointed Chief of the General Staff of the Fifth Army, which post he held until the conclusion of the armistice. Later he was [illegible] Vali of Konia, Aydın and Izmir. In 1917 he was appointed Minister of Marine, which post he held until the Armistice. He was then appointed Chief Secretary to the Grand Vizier, and was [illegible] with the Commission of Enquiry sent to Anatolia by the Sultan. He resigned this post in May 1919, and was sent to Angora by the Sultan to persuade Mustafa Kemal to disband the Nationalist Army. Instead of carrying out his instructions, he joined the Nationalist movement. In October 1919 he was appointed Minister of Marine in the Nationalist Government, and in the 27th Government of Fevzi Pasha he was Minister of Public Works. He was elected deputy for Izmir in the first National Assembly, and was Minister of Agriculture in the Government of Ankara. He was appointed Ambassador to Berlin in May 1924, but resigned in October of the same year. He was elected deputy for Izmir in the second National Assembly, and was Minister of Public Works

from the army and was elected Deputy for Cotesdarcket. Was president of the National Defence Commission of the Assembly from November 1928 to November 1930, and was a member of the same commission since the latter date. Re-elected Deputy for Seine-et-Oise in April 1931.

Nazli Fishere is short, very fat and possessed of a pleasant but very formal manner and a rounded and grating voice. Speaks French and excellent German.

Nermett Nuzli Bey

Born about 1890. Owner and editor of the Yasin newspaper, published at Constantinople. Elected Deputy for Smyrna in September 1927, and re-elected in April 1931. Instructed by commission of the Assembly in November 1927. Was state delegate to the International Press Conference at Geneva in May 1928. Delegate to the Foreign Affairs Congress of the Assembly in November 1928, elected to serve on the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Assembly in April 1929, and re-elected in October 1931. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Kellogg Pact conference in Paris in July 1928. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Naval Conference in London in January 1930. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Disarmament Conference at Geneva in February 1932. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Economic Conference at London in June 1933. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in June 1936. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in July 1936. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in August 1936. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in September 1936. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in October 1936. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in November 1936. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in December 1936. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in January 1937. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in February 1937. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in March 1937. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in April 1937. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in May 1937. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in June 1937. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in July 1937. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in August 1937. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in September 1937. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in October 1937. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in November 1937. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in December 1937. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in January 1938. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in February 1938. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in March 1938. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in April 1938. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in May 1938. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in June 1938. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in July 1938. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in August 1938. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in September 1938. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in October 1938. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in November 1938. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in December 1938. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in January 1939. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in February 1939. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in March 1939. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in April 1939. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in May 1939. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in June 1939. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in July 1939. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in August 1939. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in September 1939. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in October 1939. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in November 1939. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in December 1939. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in January 1940. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in February 1940. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in March 1940. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in April 1940. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in May 1940. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in June 1940. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in July 1940. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in August 1940. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in September 1940. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in October 1940. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in November 1940. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in December 1940. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in January 1941. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in February 1941. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in March 1941. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in April 1941. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in May 1941. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in June 1941. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in July 1941. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in August 1941. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in September 1941. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in October 1941. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in November 1941. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in December 1941. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in January 1942. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in February 1942. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in March 1942. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in April 1942. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in May 1942. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in June 1942. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in July 1942. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in August 1942. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in September 1942. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in October 1942. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in November 1942. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in December 1942. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in January 1943. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in February 1943. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in March 1943. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in April 1943. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in May 1943. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in June 1943. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in July 1943. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in August 1943. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in September 1943. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in October 1943. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in November 1943. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in December 1943. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in January 1944. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in February 1944. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in March 1944. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in April 1944. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in May 1944. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in June 1944. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in July 1944. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in August 1944. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in September 1944. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in October 1944. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in November 1944. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in December 1944. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in January 1945. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in February 1945. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in March 1945. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in April 1945. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in May 1945. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in June 1945. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in July 1945. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in August 1945. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in September 1945. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in October 1945. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in November 1945. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in December 1945. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in January 1946. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in February 1946. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in March 1946. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in April 1946. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in May 1946. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in June 1946. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in July 1946. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in August 1946. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in September 1946. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in October 1946. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in November 1946. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in December 1946. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in January 1947. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in February 1947. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in March 1947. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in April 1947. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in May 1947. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in June 1947. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in July 1947. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in August 1947. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in September 1947. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in October 1947. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in November 1947. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in December 1947. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in January 1948. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in February 1948. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in March 1948. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in April 1948. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in May 1948. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in June 1948. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in July 1948. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in August 1948. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in September 1948. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in October 1948. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in November 1948. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in December 1948. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in January 1949. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in February 1949. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in March 1949. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in April 1949. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in May 1949. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in June 1949. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in July 1949. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in August 1949. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in September 1949. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in October 1949. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in November 1949. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in December 1949. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in January 1950. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in February 1950. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in March 1950. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in April 1950. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in May 1950. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in June 1950. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in July 1950. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in August 1950. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in September 1950. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in October 1950. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in November 1950. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in December 1950. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in January 1951. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in February 1951. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in March 1951. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in April 1951. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in May 1951. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in June 1951. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in July 1951. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in August 1951. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in September 1951. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in October 1951. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in November 1951. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in December 1951. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in January 1952. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in February 1952. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in March 1952. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in April 1952. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in May 1952. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in June 1952. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in July 1952. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in August 1952. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in September 1952. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in October 1952. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in November 1952. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in December 1952. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in January 1953. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in February 1953. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in March 1953. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in April 1953. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in May 1953. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in June 1953. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in July 1953. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in August 1953. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in September 1953. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in October 1953. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in November 1953. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in December 1953. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in January 1954. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in February 1954. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in March 1954. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in April 1954. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in May 1954. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in June 1954. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in July 1954. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in August 1954. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in September 1954. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in October 1954. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in November 1954. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in December 1954. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in January 1955. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in February 1955. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in March 1955. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in April 1955. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in May 1955. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in June 1955. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in July 1955. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in August 1955. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in September 1955. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in October 1955. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in November 1955. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in December 1955. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in January 1956. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in February 1956. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in March 1956. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in April 1956. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in May 1956. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in June 1956. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in July 1956. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in August 1956. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in September 1956. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in October 1956. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in November 1956. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in December 1956. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in January 1957. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in February 1957. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in March 1957. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in April 1957. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in May 1957. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in June 1957. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in July 1957. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in August 1957. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in September 1957. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in October 1957. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in November 1957. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in December 1957. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in January 1958. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in February 1958. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in March 1958. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in April 1958. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in May 1958. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in June 1958. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in July 1958. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in August 1958. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in September 1958. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in October 1958. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in November 1958. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in December 1958. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in January 1959. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in February 1959. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in March 1959. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in April 1959. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in May 1959. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in June 1959. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in July 1959. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in August 1959. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in September 1959. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in October 1959. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in November 1959. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in December 1959. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in January 1960. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in February 1960. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in March 1960. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in April 1960. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in May 1960. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in June 1960. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in July 1960. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in August 1960. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in September 1960. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in October 1960. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in November 1960. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in December 1960. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in January 1961. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in February 1961. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in March 1961. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in April 1961. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in May 1961. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in June 1961. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in July 1961. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in August 1961. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in September 1961. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in October 1961. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in November 1961. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in December 1961. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in January 1962. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in February 1962. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in March 1962. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in April 1962. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in May 1962. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in June 1962. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in July 1962. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in August 1962. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in September 1962. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in October 1962. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in November 1962. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in December 1962. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in January 1963. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in February 1963. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in March 1963. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in April 1963. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in May 1963. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in June 1963. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in July 1963. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in August 1963. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in September 1963. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in October 1963. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in November 1963. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in December 1963. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in January 1964. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in February 1964. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in March 1964. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in April 1964. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in May 1964. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in June 1964. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in July 1964. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in August 1964. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in September 1964. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in October 1964. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in November 1964. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in December 1964. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in January 1965. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in February 1965. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in March 1965. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in April 1965. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in May 1965. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in June 1965. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in July 1965. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in August 1965. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in September 1965. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in October 1965. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in November 1965. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in December 1965. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in January 1966. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in February 1966. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in March 1966. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in April 1966. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in May 1966. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in June 1966. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in July 1966. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in August 1966. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in September 1966. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in October 1966. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in November 1966. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in December 1966. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in January 1967. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in February 1967. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in March 1967. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in April 1967. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in May 1967. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in June 1967. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in July 1967. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in August 1967. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in September 1967. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in October 1967. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in November 1967. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in December 1967. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in January 1968. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in February 1968. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in March 1968. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in April 1968. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in May 1968. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in June 1968. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in July 1968. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in August 1968. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in September 1968. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in October 1968. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in November 1968. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in December 1968. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in January 1969. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in February 1969. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in March 1969. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in April 1969. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in May 1969. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in June 1969. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in July 1969. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in August 1969. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in September 1969. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in October 1969. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in November 1969. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in December 1969. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in January 1970. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in February 1970. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in March 1970. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in April 1970. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in May 1970. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in June 1970. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in July 1970. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in August 1970. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in September 1970. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in October 1970. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in November 1970. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in December 1970. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in January 1971. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in February 1971. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in March 1971. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in April 1971. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in May 1971. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in June 1971. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in July 1971. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in August 1971. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in September 1971. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in October 1971. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in November 1971. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in December 1971. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in January 1972. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in February 1972. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in March 1972. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in April 1972. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in May 1972. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in June 1972. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in July 1972. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in August 1972. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in September 1972. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in October 1972. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in November 1972. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in December 1972. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in January 1973. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in February 1973. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in March 1973. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in April 1973. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in May 1973. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in June 1973. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in July 1973. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in August 1973. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in September 1973. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in October 1973. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in November 1973. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in December 1973. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in January 1974. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in February 1974. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in March 1974. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in April 1974. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in May 1974. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in June 1974. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in July 1974. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in August 1974. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in September 1974. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in October 1974. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in November 1974. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in December 1974. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in January 1975. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in February 1975. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in March 1975. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in April 1975. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in May 1975. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in June 1975. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in July 1975. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in August 1975. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in September 1975. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in October 1975. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in November 1975. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in December 1975. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in January 1976. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in February 1976. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in March 1976. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in April 1976. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in May 1976. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in June 1976. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in July 1976. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in August 1976. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in September 1976. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in October 1976. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in November 1976. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in December 1976. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in January 1977. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in February 1977. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in March 1977. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in April 1977. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in May 1977. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in June 1977. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in July 1977. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in August 1977. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in September 1977. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in October 1977. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in November 1977. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in December 1977. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in January 1978. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in February 1978. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in March 1978. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in April 1978. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in May 1978. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in June 1978. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in July 1978. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in August 1978. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in September 1978. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in October 1978. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in November 1978. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in December 1978. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in January 1979. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in February 1979. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in March 1979. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in April 1979. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in May 1979. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in June 1979. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in July 1979. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in August 1979. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in September 1979. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in October 1979. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in November 1979. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in December 1979. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in January 1980. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in February 1980. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in March 1980. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in April 1980. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in May 1980. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in June 1980. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in July 1980. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in August 1980. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in September 1980. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in October 1980. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in November 1980. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in December 1980. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in January 1981. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in February 1981. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in March 1981. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in April 1981. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in May 1981. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in June 1981. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in July 1981. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in August 1981. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in September 1981. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in October 1981. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in November 1981. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in December 1981. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in January 1982. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in February 1982. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in March 1982. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in April 1982. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in May 1982. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the Montreux Conference in June 1982. Was a member of the Turkish delegation to the

Elected member of the Lebanon Affairs and Accounts Commission of the Assembly November 1930 and re-elected at the session November 1931.

Rauf Beys writing has appeared in newspapers during last Parliament. He rarely shows himself in public but outwardly is courteous and respectful.

Rauf Beys Wife

Born in 1888 in Constantinople, she received a good Turkish and studied wireless telegraphy at Europe. She was employed in the Directorate of Posts and Telegraphs in 1920 as supervisor in the general and legation branch.

Her work was of the secret diplomatic sort that Turkey in 1923 was in need of. In Constantinople she met Rauf Bey and after an September 1923 was married to him. After November a member of the Assembly for Smyrna. Her husband's political career in 1924 she was a prominent figure in Constantinople society. She was a member of the Congress of Peace which met in November 1924 in Constantinople. She was a member of the Assembly for Smyrna. She was a member of the Assembly for Smyrna. She was a member of the Assembly for Smyrna. She was a member of the Assembly for Smyrna.

Rauf Bey who speaks fluently English, French and German, is a keen student of the arts and literature which he has made a hobby of for many years.

Refik Bey (Hamdi)

Born in 1880. Minister of Commerce. In 1922 he was elected to the Assembly, and was still in office when the Republic was proclaimed. In 1923 he was appointed Minister of Commerce and Economy in the Cabinet of Ismet Pasha. He was a member of the Assembly for Smyrna. He was a member of the Assembly for Smyrna. He was a member of the Assembly for Smyrna. He was a member of the Assembly for Smyrna.

Refik Bey was born in 1880. He was a member of the Assembly for Smyrna. He was a member of the Assembly for Smyrna. He was a member of the Assembly for Smyrna. He was a member of the Assembly for Smyrna.

Refet Pasha

Born in 1877 at Uskub. He was employed in the gendarmerie in Macedonia. He was a member of the Assembly for Smyrna. He was a member of the Assembly for Smyrna. He was a member of the Assembly for Smyrna. He was a member of the Assembly for Smyrna.

was Minister of National Defence from July 1921 to January 1922. After the Mudania Conference was appointed Governor of Thrace but remained in Constantinople where he quickly won the confidence of the Nationalist Government and established National headquarters. In May 1923 he was elected Deputy for Constantinople and soon afterwards resigned his post which he no longer had any *raison d'être*. In the autumn he went to Lausanne to assist over the proclamation of the republic and was mentioned as a possible Cabinet Minister. He resigned his post in May 1924. He was elected to the Assembly for Smyrna. He was a member of the Assembly for Smyrna. He was a member of the Assembly for Smyrna. He was a member of the Assembly for Smyrna.

Refik Bey

Born in 1887. He was a member of the Assembly for Smyrna. He was a member of the Assembly for Smyrna. He was a member of the Assembly for Smyrna. He was a member of the Assembly for Smyrna.

Rauf Orbay Beys Wife

Born in Constantinople, she received a good education and studied wireless telegraphy at Europe. She was employed in the Directorate of Posts and Telegraphs in 1920 as supervisor in the general and legation branch.

Her work was of the secret diplomatic sort that Turkey in 1923 was in need of. In Constantinople she met Rauf Bey and after an September 1923 was married to him. After November a member of the Assembly for Smyrna. Her husband's political career in 1924 she was a prominent figure in Constantinople society. She was a member of the Congress of Peace which met in November 1924 in Constantinople. She was a member of the Assembly for Smyrna. She was a member of the Assembly for Smyrna. She was a member of the Assembly for Smyrna. She was a member of the Assembly for Smyrna.

Rauf Bey was born in 1881. He was a member of the Assembly for Smyrna. He was a member of the Assembly for Smyrna. He was a member of the Assembly for Smyrna. He was a member of the Assembly for Smyrna.

Refet Gokay Beys

Born in 1887 at Rodosto. Educated at the military school, Constantinople, and later at the staff college. He was a member of the Assembly for Smyrna. He was a member of the Assembly for Smyrna. He was a member of the Assembly for Smyrna. He was a member of the Assembly for Smyrna.

Resit Saffet Bey

Born at Constantinople circa 1883. Began life as translator in the Tobacco Regie. Later entered the Ministry for Foreign Affairs and was secretary in the Legations at Bucharest, Washington, Madrid and Tehran. During this period became a member of the C.U.P. On the outbreak of the Revolution of 1908 was appointed Director of the Private Council of the Ministry of Finance and became secretary to the Minister, Cavit Bey, who at various times sent him as propagandist agent to Vienna, Paris, Rome, and particularly during the Great War, Vienna and Berne. On the signature of the armistice in 1918 became Consul of the Turkish mission at Berne where he engaged in pro-Islamic agitation and wrote anti-British articles in the local press. On his return to Constantinople in October 1919 opened a branch of the Swiss Society for the Defence of Oriental Rights and became one of the organisers of pro-Islamic activity. Later was elected Deputy for Istanbul and became one of the most indefatigable opponents of all those who seek the Turkish race and the principal Oriental peoples of the world. Was also for the extreme wing of the Nationalist Party after 1921 but the Treaty of Mudania kept him in office. In October 1922 was appointed secretary-general of the Turkish Peace Delegation at Lausanne. In 1923 was adviser to Turkish delegation at Fourth Session of International Red Cross Conference at Geneva and accompanied Ismet Pasha on his visit to England. Was elected Deputy for Istanbul in August 1923 and was appointed Minister of Commerce and Agriculture in October 1923. Was dismissed from office in March 1924 and was elected Deputy for Istanbul in June 1924. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in November 1924 and resigned in February 1925. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in March 1925 and resigned in June 1925. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in July 1925 and resigned in October 1925. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in October 1925 and resigned in December 1925. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in December 1925 and resigned in January 1926. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in January 1926 and resigned in February 1926. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in February 1926 and resigned in March 1926. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in March 1926 and resigned in April 1926. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in April 1926 and resigned in May 1926. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in May 1926 and resigned in June 1926. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in June 1926 and resigned in July 1926. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in July 1926 and resigned in August 1926. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in August 1926 and resigned in September 1926. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in September 1926 and resigned in October 1926. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in October 1926 and resigned in November 1926. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in November 1926 and resigned in December 1926. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in December 1926 and resigned in January 1927. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in January 1927 and resigned in February 1927. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in February 1927 and resigned in March 1927. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in March 1927 and resigned in April 1927. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in April 1927 and resigned in May 1927. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in May 1927 and resigned in June 1927. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in June 1927 and resigned in July 1927. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in July 1927 and resigned in August 1927. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in August 1927 and resigned in September 1927. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in September 1927 and resigned in October 1927. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in October 1927 and resigned in November 1927. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in November 1927 and resigned in December 1927. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in December 1927 and resigned in January 1928. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in January 1928 and resigned in February 1928. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in February 1928 and resigned in March 1928. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in March 1928 and resigned in April 1928. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in April 1928 and resigned in May 1928. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in May 1928 and resigned in June 1928. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in June 1928 and resigned in July 1928. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in July 1928 and resigned in August 1928. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in August 1928 and resigned in September 1928. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in September 1928 and resigned in October 1928. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in October 1928 and resigned in November 1928. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in November 1928 and resigned in December 1928. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in December 1928 and resigned in January 1929. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in January 1929 and resigned in February 1929. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in February 1929 and resigned in March 1929. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in March 1929 and resigned in April 1929. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in April 1929 and resigned in May 1929. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in May 1929 and resigned in June 1929. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in June 1929 and resigned in July 1929. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in July 1929 and resigned in August 1929. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in August 1929 and resigned in September 1929. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in September 1929 and resigned in October 1929. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in October 1929 and resigned in November 1929. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in November 1929 and resigned in December 1929. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in December 1929 and resigned in January 1930. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in January 1930 and resigned in February 1930. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in February 1930 and resigned in March 1930. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in March 1930 and resigned in April 1930. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in April 1930 and resigned in May 1930. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in May 1930 and resigned in June 1930. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in June 1930 and resigned in July 1930. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in July 1930 and resigned in August 1930. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in August 1930 and resigned in September 1930. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in September 1930 and resigned in October 1930. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in October 1930 and resigned in November 1930. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in November 1930 and resigned in December 1930. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in December 1930 and resigned in January 1931. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in January 1931 and resigned in February 1931. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in February 1931 and resigned in March 1931. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in March 1931 and resigned in April 1931. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in April 1931 and resigned in May 1931. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in May 1931 and resigned in June 1931. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in June 1931 and resigned in July 1931. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in July 1931 and resigned in August 1931. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in August 1931 and resigned in September 1931. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in September 1931 and resigned in October 1931. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in October 1931 and resigned in November 1931. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in November 1931 and resigned in December 1931. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in December 1931 and resigned in January 1932. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in January 1932 and resigned in February 1932. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in February 1932 and resigned in March 1932. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in March 1932 and resigned in April 1932. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in April 1932 and resigned in May 1932. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in May 1932 and resigned in June 1932. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in June 1932 and resigned in July 1932. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in July 1932 and resigned in August 1932. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in August 1932 and resigned in September 1932. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in September 1932 and resigned in October 1932. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in October 1932 and resigned in November 1932. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in November 1932 and resigned in December 1932. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in December 1932 and resigned in January 1933. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in January 1933 and resigned in February 1933. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in February 1933 and resigned in March 1933. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in March 1933 and resigned in April 1933. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in April 1933 and resigned in May 1933. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in May 1933 and resigned in June 1933. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in June 1933 and resigned in July 1933. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in July 1933 and resigned in August 1933. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in August 1933 and resigned in September 1933. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in September 1933 and resigned in October 1933. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in October 1933 and resigned in November 1933. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in November 1933 and resigned in December 1933. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in December 1933 and resigned in January 1934. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in January 1934 and resigned in February 1934. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in February 1934 and resigned in March 1934. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in March 1934 and resigned in April 1934. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in April 1934 and resigned in May 1934. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in May 1934 and resigned in June 1934. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in June 1934 and resigned in July 1934. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in July 1934 and resigned in August 1934. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in August 1934 and resigned in September 1934. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in September 1934 and resigned in October 1934. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in October 1934 and resigned in November 1934. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in November 1934 and resigned in December 1934. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in December 1934 and resigned in January 1935. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in January 1935 and resigned in February 1935. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in February 1935 and resigned in March 1935. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in March 1935 and resigned in April 1935. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in April 1935 and resigned in May 1935. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in May 1935 and resigned in June 1935. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in June 1935 and resigned in July 1935. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in July 1935 and resigned in August 1935. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in August 1935 and resigned in September 1935. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in September 1935 and resigned in October 1935. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in October 1935 and resigned in November 1935. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in November 1935 and resigned in December 1935. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in December 1935 and resigned in January 1936. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in January 1936 and resigned in February 1936. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in February 1936 and resigned in March 1936. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in March 1936 and resigned in April 1936. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in April 1936 and resigned in May 1936. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in May 1936 and resigned in June 1936. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in June 1936 and resigned in July 1936. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in July 1936 and resigned in August 1936. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in August 1936 and resigned in September 1936. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in September 1936 and resigned in October 1936. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in October 1936 and resigned in November 1936. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in November 1936 and resigned in December 1936. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in December 1936 and resigned in January 1937. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in January 1937 and resigned in February 1937. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in February 1937 and resigned in March 1937. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in March 1937 and resigned in April 1937. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in April 1937 and resigned in May 1937. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in May 1937 and resigned in June 1937. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in June 1937 and resigned in July 1937. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in July 1937 and resigned in August 1937. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in August 1937 and resigned in September 1937. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in September 1937 and resigned in October 1937. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in October 1937 and resigned in November 1937. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in November 1937 and resigned in December 1937. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in December 1937 and resigned in January 1938. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in January 1938 and resigned in February 1938. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in February 1938 and resigned in March 1938. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in March 1938 and resigned in April 1938. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in April 1938 and resigned in May 1938. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in May 1938 and resigned in June 1938. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in June 1938 and resigned in July 1938. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in July 1938 and resigned in August 1938. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in August 1938 and resigned in September 1938. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in September 1938 and resigned in October 1938. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in October 1938 and resigned in November 1938. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in November 1938 and resigned in December 1938. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in December 1938 and resigned in January 1939. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in January 1939 and resigned in February 1939. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in February 1939 and resigned in March 1939. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in March 1939 and resigned in April 1939. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in April 1939 and resigned in May 1939. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in May 1939 and resigned in June 1939. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in June 1939 and resigned in July 1939. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in July 1939 and resigned in August 1939. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in August 1939 and resigned in September 1939. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in September 1939 and resigned in October 1939. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in October 1939 and resigned in November 1939. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in November 1939 and resigned in December 1939. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in December 1939 and resigned in January 1940. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in January 1940 and resigned in February 1940. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in February 1940 and resigned in March 1940. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in March 1940 and resigned in April 1940. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in April 1940 and resigned in May 1940. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in May 1940 and resigned in June 1940. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in June 1940 and resigned in July 1940. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in July 1940 and resigned in August 1940. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in August 1940 and resigned in September 1940. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in September 1940 and resigned in October 1940. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in October 1940 and resigned in November 1940. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in November 1940 and resigned in December 1940. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in December 1940 and resigned in January 1941. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in January 1941 and resigned in February 1941. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in February 1941 and resigned in March 1941. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in March 1941 and resigned in April 1941. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in April 1941 and resigned in May 1941. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in May 1941 and resigned in June 1941. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in June 1941 and resigned in July 1941. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in July 1941 and resigned in August 1941. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in August 1941 and resigned in September 1941. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in September 1941 and resigned in October 1941. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in October 1941 and resigned in November 1941. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in November 1941 and resigned in December 1941. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in December 1941 and resigned in January 1942. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in January 1942 and resigned in February 1942. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in February 1942 and resigned in March 1942. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in March 1942 and resigned in April 1942. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in April 1942 and resigned in May 1942. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in May 1942 and resigned in June 1942. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in June 1942 and resigned in July 1942. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in July 1942 and resigned in August 1942. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in August 1942 and resigned in September 1942. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in September 1942 and resigned in October 1942. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in October 1942 and resigned in November 1942. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in November 1942 and resigned in December 1942. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in December 1942 and resigned in January 1943. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in January 1943 and resigned in February 1943. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in February 1943 and resigned in March 1943. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in March 1943 and resigned in April 1943. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in April 1943 and resigned in May 1943. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in May 1943 and resigned in June 1943. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in June 1943 and resigned in July 1943. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in July 1943 and resigned in August 1943. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in August 1943 and resigned in September 1943. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in September 1943 and resigned in October 1943. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in October 1943 and resigned in November 1943. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in November 1943 and resigned in December 1943. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in December 1943 and resigned in January 1944. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in January 1944 and resigned in February 1944. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in February 1944 and resigned in March 1944. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in March 1944 and resigned in April 1944. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in April 1944 and resigned in May 1944. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in May 1944 and resigned in June 1944. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in June 1944 and resigned in July 1944. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in July 1944 and resigned in August 1944. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in August 1944 and resigned in September 1944. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in September 1944 and resigned in October 1944. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in October 1944 and resigned in November 1944. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in November 1944 and resigned in December 1944. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in December 1944 and resigned in January 1945. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in January 1945 and resigned in February 1945. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in February 1945 and resigned in March 1945. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in March 1945 and resigned in April 1945. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in April 1945 and resigned in May 1945. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in May 1945 and resigned in June 1945. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in June 1945 and resigned in July 1945. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in July 1945 and resigned in August 1945. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in August 1945 and resigned in September 1945. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in September 1945 and resigned in October 1945. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in October 1945 and resigned in November 1945. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in November 1945 and resigned in December 1945. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in December 1945 and resigned in January 1946. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in January 1946 and resigned in February 1946. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in February 1946 and resigned in March 1946. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in March 1946 and resigned in April 1946. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in April 1946 and resigned in May 1946. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in May 1946 and resigned in June 1946. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in June 1946 and resigned in July 1946. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in July 1946 and resigned in August 1946. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in August 1946 and resigned in September 1946. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in September 1946 and resigned in October 1946. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in October 1946 and resigned in November 1946. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in November 1946 and resigned in December 1946. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in December 1946 and resigned in January 1947. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in January 1947 and resigned in February 1947. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in February 1947 and resigned in March 1947. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in March 1947 and resigned in April 1947. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in April 1947 and resigned in May 1947. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in May 1947 and resigned in June 1947. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in June 1947 and resigned in July 1947. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in July 1947 and resigned in August 1947. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in August 1947 and resigned in September 1947. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in September 1947 and resigned in October 1947. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in October 1947 and resigned in November 1947. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in November 1947 and resigned in December 1947. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in December 1947 and resigned in January 1948. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in January 1948 and resigned in February 1948. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in February 1948 and resigned in March 1948. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in March 1948 and resigned in April 1948. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in April 1948 and resigned in May 1948. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in May 1948 and resigned in June 1948. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in June 1948 and resigned in July 1948. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in July 1948 and resigned in August 1948. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in August 1948 and resigned in September 1948. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in September 1948 and resigned in October 1948. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in October 1948 and resigned in November 1948. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in November 1948 and resigned in December 1948. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in December 1948 and resigned in January 1949. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in January 1949 and resigned in February 1949. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in February 1949 and resigned in March 1949. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in March 1949 and resigned in April 1949. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in April 1949 and resigned in May 1949. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in May 1949 and resigned in June 1949. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in June 1949 and resigned in July 1949. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in July 1949 and resigned in August 1949. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in August 1949 and resigned in September 1949. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in September 1949 and resigned in October 1949. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in October 1949 and resigned in November 1949. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in November 1949 and resigned in December 1949. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in December 1949 and resigned in January 1950. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in January 1950 and resigned in February 1950. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in February 1950 and resigned in March 1950. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in March 1950 and resigned in April 1950. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in April 1950 and resigned in May 1950. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in May 1950 and resigned in June 1950. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in June 1950 and resigned in July 1950. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in July 1950 and resigned in August 1950. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in August 1950 and resigned in September 1950. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in September 1950 and resigned in October 1950. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in October 1950 and resigned in November 1950. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in November 1950 and resigned in December 1950. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in December 1950 and resigned in January 1951. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in January 1951 and resigned in February 1951. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in February 1951 and resigned in March 1951. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in March 1951 and resigned in April 1951. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in April 1951 and resigned in May 1951. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in May 1951 and resigned in June 1951. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in June 1951 and resigned in July 1951. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in July 1951 and resigned in August 1951. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in August 1951 and resigned in September 1951. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in September 1951 and resigned in October 1951. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in October 1951 and resigned in November 1951. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in November 1951 and resigned in December 1951. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in December 1951 and resigned in January 1952. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in January 1952 and resigned in February 1952. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in February 1952 and resigned in March 1952. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in March 1952 and resigned in April 1952. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in April 1952 and resigned in May 1952. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in May 1952 and resigned in June 1952. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in June 1952 and resigned in July 1952. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in July 1952 and resigned in August 1952. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in August 1952 and resigned in September 1952. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in September 1952 and resigned in October 1952. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in October 1952 and resigned in November 1952. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in November 1952 and resigned in December 1952. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in December 1952 and resigned in January 1953. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in January 1953 and resigned in February 1953. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in February 1953 and resigned in March 1953. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in March 1953 and resigned in April 1953. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in April 1953 and resigned in May 1953. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in May 1953 and resigned in June 1953. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in June 1953 and resigned in July 1953. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in July 1953 and resigned in August 1953. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in August 1953 and resigned in September 1953. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in September 1953 and resigned in October 1953. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in October 1953 and resigned in November 1953. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in November 1953 and resigned in December 1953. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in December 1953 and resigned in January 1954. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in January 1954 and resigned in February 1954. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in February 1954 and resigned in March 1954. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in March 1954 and resigned in April 1954. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in April 1954 and resigned in May 1954. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in May 1954 and resigned in June 1954. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in June 1954 and resigned in July 1954. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in July 1954 and resigned in August 1954. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in August 1954 and resigned in September 1954. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in September 1954 and resigned in October 1954. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in October 1954 and resigned in November 1954. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in November 1954 and resigned in December 1954. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in December 1954 and resigned in January 1955. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in January 1955 and resigned in February 1955. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in February 1955 and resigned in March 1955. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in March 1955 and resigned in April 1955. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in April 1955 and resigned in May 1955. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in May 1955 and resigned in June 1955. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in June 1955 and resigned in July 1955. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in July 1955 and resigned in August 1955. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in August 1955 and resigned in September 1955. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in September 1955 and resigned in October 1955. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in October 1955 and resigned in November 1955. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in November 1955 and resigned in December 1955. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in December 1955 and resigned in January 1956. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in January 1956 and resigned in February 1956. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in February 1956 and resigned in March 1956. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in March 1956 and resigned in April 1956. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in April 1956 and resigned in May 1956. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in May 1956 and resigned in June 1956. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in June 1956 and resigned in July 1956. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in July 1956 and resigned in August 1956. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in August 1956 and resigned in September 1956. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in September 1956 and resigned in October 1956. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in October 1956 and resigned in November 1956. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in November 1956 and resigned in December 1956. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in December 1956 and resigned in January 1957. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in January 1957 and resigned in February 1957. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in February 1957 and resigned in March 1957. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in March 1957 and resigned in April 1957. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in April 1957 and resigned in May 1957. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in May 1957 and resigned in June 1957. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in June 1957 and resigned in July 1957. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in July 1957 and resigned in August 1957. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in August 1957 and resigned in September 1957. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in September 1957 and resigned in October 1957. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in October 1957 and resigned in November 1957. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in November 1957 and resigned in December 1957. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in December 1957 and resigned in January 1958. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in January 1958 and resigned in February 1958. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in February 1958 and resigned in March 1958. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in March 1958 and resigned in April 1958. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in April 1958 and resigned in May 1958. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in May 1958 and resigned in June 1958. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in June 1958 and resigned in July 1958. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in July 1958 and resigned in August 1958. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in August 1958 and resigned in September 1958. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in September 1958 and resigned in October 1958. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in October 1958 and resigned in November 1958. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in November 1958 and resigned in December 1958. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in December 1958 and resigned in January 1959. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in January 1959 and resigned in February 1959. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in February 1959 and resigned in March 1959. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in March 1959 and resigned in April 1959. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in April 1959 and resigned in May 1959. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in May 1959 and resigned in June 1959. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in June 1959 and resigned in July 1959. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in July 1959 and resigned in August 1959. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in August 1959 and resigned in September 1959. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in September 1959 and resigned in October 1959. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in October 1959 and resigned in November 1959. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in November 1959 and resigned in December 1959. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in December 1959 and resigned in January 1960. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in January 1960 and resigned in February 1960. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in February 1960 and resigned in March 1960. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in March 1960 and resigned in April 1960. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in April 1960 and resigned in May 1960. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in May 1960 and resigned in June 1960. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in June 1960 and resigned in July 1960. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in July 1960 and resigned in August 1960. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in August 1960 and resigned in September 1960. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in September 1960 and resigned in October 1960. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in October 1960 and resigned in November 1960. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in November 1960 and resigned in December 1960. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in December 1960 and resigned in January 1961. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in January 1961 and resigned in February 1961. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in February 1961 and resigned in March 1961. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in March 1961 and resigned in April 1961. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in April 1961 and resigned in May 1961. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in May 1961 and resigned in June 1961. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in June 1961 and resigned in July 1961. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in July 1961 and resigned in August 1961. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in August 1961 and resigned in September 1961. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in September 1961 and resigned in October 1961. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in October 1961 and resigned in November 1961. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in November 1961 and resigned in December 1961. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in December 1961 and resigned in January 1962. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in January 1962 and resigned in February 1962. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in February 1962 and resigned in March 1962. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in March 1962 and resigned in April 1962. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in April 1962 and resigned in May 1962. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in May 1962 and resigned in June 1962. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in June 1962 and resigned in July 1962. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in July 1962 and resigned in August 1962. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in August 1962 and resigned in September 1962. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in September 1962 and resigned in October 1962. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in October 1962 and resigned in November 1962. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in November 1962 and resigned in December 1962. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in December 1962 and resigned in January 1963. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in January 1963 and resigned in February 1963. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in February 1963 and resigned in March 1963. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in March 1963 and resigned in April 1963. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in April 1963 and resigned in May 1963. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in May 1963 and resigned in June 1963. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in June 1963 and resigned in July 1963. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in July 1963 and resigned in August 1963. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in August 1963 and resigned in September 1963. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in September 1963 and resigned in October 1963. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in October 1963 and resigned in November 1963. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in November 1963 and resigned in December 1963. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in December 1963 and resigned in January 1964. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in January 1964 and resigned in February 1964. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in February 1964 and resigned in March 1964. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in March 1964 and resigned in April 1964. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in April 1964 and resigned in May 1964. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in May 1964 and resigned in June 1964. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in June 1964 and resigned in July 1964. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in July 1964 and resigned in August 1964. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in August 1964 and resigned in September 1964. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in September 1964 and resigned in October 1964. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in October 1964 and resigned in November 1964. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in November 1964 and resigned in December 1964. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in December 1964 and resigned in January 1965. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in January 1965 and resigned in February 1965. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in February 1965 and resigned in March 1965. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in March 1965 and resigned in April 1965. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in April 1965 and resigned in May 1965. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in May 1965 and resigned in June 1965. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in June 1965 and resigned in July 1965. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in July 1965 and resigned in August 1965. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in August 1965 and resigned in September 1965. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in September 1965 and resigned in October 1965. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in October 1965 and resigned in November 1965. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in November 1965 and resigned in December 1965. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in December 1965 and resigned in January 1966. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in January 1966 and resigned in February 1966. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in February 1966 and resigned in March 1966. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in March 1966 and resigned in April 1966. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in April 1966 and resigned in May 1966. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in May 1966 and resigned in June 1966. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in June 1966 and resigned in July 1966. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in July 1966 and resigned in August 1966. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in August 1966 and resigned in September 1966. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in September 1966 and resigned in October 1966. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in October 1966 and resigned in November 1966. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in November 1966 and resigned in December 1966. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in December 1966 and resigned in January 1967. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in January 1967 and resigned in February 1967. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in February 1967 and resigned in March 1967. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in March 1967 and resigned in April 1967. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in April 1967 and resigned in May 1967. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in May 1967 and resigned in June 1967. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in June 1967 and resigned in July 1967. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in July 1967 and resigned in August 1967. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in August 1967 and resigned in September 1967. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in September 1967 and resigned in October 1967. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in October 1967 and resigned in November 1967. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in November 1967 and resigned in December 1967. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in December 1967 and resigned in January 1968. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in January 1968 and resigned in February 1968. Was appointed Minister of Commerce in February 1968 and resigned in March 1968. Was appointed Minister of Public Instruction in March 1968 and resigned in April 1968.

Şakir Bey

Born at Veles about 1882. Educated at Constantinople and early entered the service of the Ministry of Interior. Was for some time secretary at the Adrianople Vilayet and later became Kaimakam at Archar. Became Deputy for Gallipoli in 1920, and throughout the nationalist movement a leading spirit of the Kemalist movement in Thrace. In 1921 was the official nationalist agent in Sofia. Took no active part in the fighting during the Greek advance. In October 1922 he was appointed Vali of Adrianople and established the Kemalist Administration there. Early in the following year he transferred his activities to Constantinople, which he was still visiting. Was Deputy for Adrianople since 1920. Member of the Assembly Budget Commission. Has also been elected Deputy for Kastamuni. Was Minister of Public Instruction in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1924–5. Was Minister of Public Works in 1925–6. Was Minister of Agriculture, Economy and Colonisation in Fethi Bey's Cabinet of 1926–7. Was Minister of Interior in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1927–8. Was Minister of Public Works in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1928–30. Was Minister of Agriculture in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1930–1. Was Minister of Interior in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1931–2. Was Minister of Public Works in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1932–3. Was Minister of Interior in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1933–4. Was Minister of Public Works in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1934–5. Was Minister of Interior in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1935–6. Was Minister of Public Works in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1936–7. Was Minister of Interior in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1937–8. Was Minister of Public Works in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1938–9. Was Minister of Interior in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1939–40. Was Minister of Public Works in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1940–1. Was Minister of Interior in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1941–2. Was Minister of Public Works in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1942–3. Was Minister of Interior in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1943–4. Was Minister of Public Works in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1944–5. Was Minister of Interior in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1945–6. Was Minister of Public Works in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1946–7. Was Minister of Interior in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1947–8. Was Minister of Public Works in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1948–9. Was Minister of Interior in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1949–50. Was Minister of Public Works in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1950–1. Was Minister of Interior in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1951–2. Was Minister of Public Works in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1952–3. Was Minister of Interior in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1953–4. Was Minister of Public Works in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1954–5. Was Minister of Interior in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1955–6. Was Minister of Public Works in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1956–7. Was Minister of Interior in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1957–8. Was Minister of Public Works in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1958–9. Was Minister of Interior in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1959–60. Was Minister of Public Works in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1960–1. Was Minister of Interior in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1961–2. Was Minister of Public Works in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1962–3. Was Minister of Interior in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1963–4. Was Minister of Public Works in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1964–5. Was Minister of Interior in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1965–6. Was Minister of Public Works in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1966–7. Was Minister of Interior in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1967–8. Was Minister of Public Works in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1968–9. Was Minister of Interior in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1969–70. Was Minister of Public Works in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1970–1. Was Minister of Interior in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1971–2. Was Minister of Public Works in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1972–3. Was Minister of Interior in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1973–4. Was Minister of Public Works in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1974–5. Was Minister of Interior in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1975–6. Was Minister of Public Works in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1976–7. Was Minister of Interior in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1977–8. Was Minister of Public Works in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1978–9. Was Minister of Interior in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1979–80. Was Minister of Public Works in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1980–1. Was Minister of Interior in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1981–2. Was Minister of Public Works in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1982–3. Was Minister of Interior in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1983–4. Was Minister of Public Works in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1984–5. Was Minister of Interior in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1985–6. Was Minister of Public Works in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1986–7. Was Minister of Interior in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1987–8. Was Minister of Public Works in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1988–9. Was Minister of Interior in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1989–90. Was Minister of Public Works in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1990–1. Was Minister of Interior in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1991–2. Was Minister of Public Works in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1992–3. Was Minister of Interior in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1993–4. Was Minister of Public Works in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1994–5. Was Minister of Interior in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1995–6. Was Minister of Public Works in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1996–7. Was Minister of Interior in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1997–8. Was Minister of Public Works in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1998–9. Was Minister of Interior in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 1999–2000. Was Minister of Public Works in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 2000–1. Was Minister of Interior in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 2001–2. Was Minister of Public Works in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 2002–3. Was Minister of Interior in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 2003–4. Was Minister of Public Works in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 2004–5. Was Minister of Interior in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of 2005–6. Was Minister of Public Works in Ismet Pasha's Cabinet of

Tevfik Kamil Bey

Born in 1889, at Constantinople. Educated there. A career diplomat. Studied law in Paris, until 1911, and entered diplomatic service, starting by serving for some time at Smyrna Consulate. He was elected secretary to the Turkish delegation at the Second Lausanne Conference in 1923, and on his return to Angora became Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs. As such he was charged with the negotiations of friendship treaties with several foreign countries, and gradually exercised increasing influence. Resigned in October 1925, on his election as Deputy for Constantinople. In 1926 he became a member of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Assembly, and by his expert knowledge made his influence felt. In 1927 he was responsible for the drafting of a note addressed to the Turkish Embassies. Represented Turkey at the Interparliamentary Conference at Athens in November 1927. Failed to be re-elected to the Assembly a year later, but was afterwards succeeded by Hasan Bey as chief Turkish delegate to the Mixed Exchange Commission, where he was present in his predecessor's place. Is a hard worker and a lover of straight talk. Foreign Ministry, with which he is always in close contact. In April 1931 was posted as Minister to Sofia, where, according to the Turkish press, he has always been a friend of Turkey's cause in Balkan political circles.

Tevfik Kamil Bey is quite a delightful person to talk to. He is somewhat shy and reserved at first, but better acquaintance will soon enable him to speak freely to you. He is a keen observer of passing events, and is well read.

Ismet Bey (Inönü)

Born in 1885. Doctor in the military service. In 1908 was military attaché to Committee of Union and Progress Government at Sofia. Served as a commander in the Balkan War, and was taken prisoner by the Serbs. In 1920 was a member of the mission to Russia, after Enver's Nationalist movement was thoroughly established in Angora. Joined Department of Foreign Affairs, and in 1921 was appointed Minister of Foreign Affairs. Was elected to the Assembly as Deputy for Smyrna, but resigned this seat to become Commander-in-Chief of the Western Front, a post he held for about a year. Was about to proceed to the Peace Conference in London when the Greek advance in Anatolia compelled him to remain with the army. Resigned in September 1921, over his refusal to sign the Sèvres Treaty, which he considered as regards the proposed settlement of Smyrna to be a violation of the Mudros agreement. In March 1925 became Minister for Foreign Affairs. Proceeded to Lausanne as Turkish plenipotentiary, and on conclusion of the Mosul dispute and signed the Angora Treaty in June 1926. During the summer of 1926 his position was weakened owing to his relations with Djavid Bey and Dr Nazim, who were found to have conspired to kill the Ghazi, and with whom Ismet Pasha was believed to be in sympathy. Although he was not implicated in the plot, he was forced to resign the premiership in October 1926, and was succeeded by Djavid Bey. Ismet Pasha remained Minister for Foreign Affairs, and during the summer of 1927 he and Djavid Bey were the two most prominent figures in Turkish politics. Djavid Bey's unpopularity, however, was increasing, and Ismet Pasha was generally regarded as the coming man. Djavid Bey resigned in October 1927, and Ismet Pasha became Prime Minister. He was re-elected to the Assembly as Deputy for Erzerum in November 1927. In May 1928 attended Preparatory Disarmament Conference at Geneva, and during the year his position seemed to become steadily stronger. In September 1930 paid an official visit to Moscow. In November headed the Turkish delegation to the Preparatory Disarmament Conference at Geneva, and in December visited Signor Mussolini at Rome, and was received by the King. Was the moving spirit on the Turkish side in the Greco-Turkish rapprochement which led to M. Venizelos's visit to Angora in October 1930, when the two countries signed a pact of friendship, and the Prime Minister's return visit to Athens in October 1931.

Tevfik Rüstü Bey is of shovelled appearance, and veils his features behind monumental dark glasses. He is said to be able and voluble, that he pours out the Ghazi's real influence on Turkish foreign policy is difficult to determine, though his subservience to Ismet Pasha in public affairs, and his adherence to the theory that he is content for the most part to take his orders from his superiors.

Hamdi Bey

Born about 1885. In 1923 became Deputy for Sarid, and Public Prosecutor of Independence Tribunal sent to Constantinople. In March 1924 became Minister of Public Instruction, resigning in November. June 1925, Minister at Prague, and November 1927, at Budapest. In November 1928 became Ambassador in Moscow, but in January 1929 was elected Deputy for Smyrna, and resigned his post. In February became Minister of Public Instruction for the second time, but resigned in April. Represented Turkey at the International Parliamentary Conference at Berlin in August. Is a member of the Foreign Affairs Commission, and one of the Vice-Presidents of the Assembly.

Yusuf Bey is tall, and heavy in appearance. Is loud and genial, and something of a bully in occasion. Has shown conspicuous friendliness to His Majesty's Embassy, and is reputed to be the leader of the Anglophil camp. One of the Ghazi's boon companions.

Hamdi Yunus Bey

Born 1878. Educated in Rhodes. Became a protégé of Abdul Pasha Dino, who paid for his studies, but dismissed him after two years because of his views. Emerged from obscurity in 1908, and became one of the Committee of Union and Progress leaders in Smyrna, on the Chamber of Deputies. In 1911 became editor of the Committee of Union and Progress "Tasvir-i-Efkar," and in 1916 started the Yeni [illegible] Jones received £T 30,000 from secret funds of Union and Progress funds. Was imprisoned soon after the armistice, but was soon released, and published articles in the Allies' interests in the opposition Constantinople papers. On the occupation of Constantinople in March 1920 he escaped to Angora, and for a short time was secretary to Mustafa Kemal. Began publishing a paper there, and was Deputy for Smyrna. In February 1921 he was a member of the Angora delegation to Paris and London, but returned to Constantinople on the failure of Mr Churchill's mission. Because of his sympathy with Enver, but in 1922 was re-elected to the Assembly for Smyrna, but failed to be re-elected for Sarid. Was President of the Independence Tribunal sent to Constantinople. Through the influence of Mr Ryan, the Smyrna American consul, he was appointed Deputy for Mersina, since 1921. In 1923 visited the Continent, and Constantinople, and soon after the Young Turk Congress at Izmir, September 1923, he was elected President of the Constituent Assembly, and 1926–27 was also a member of the Foreign Affairs Commission. In 1927–28 took the leading part in the discussions of the former Ministers of Marine and Commerce, and various subjects. Spent the summer of 1928 in Russia and Germany, and on his return steadily established his Russophil sentiments. In November became member of Executive Bureau of Republican party. In 1929 again visited Germany several times. During the summer of 1931 engaged in the scurrilous press controversy with some exiles of the opposition, which led to the latest important press law of the 24th July. Acted against the latter. Accompanied Ismet Pasha and Tevfik Rüstü Bey on their visit to Athens in October.

Yunus Nadi Bey is short and stout, and wears pince-nez. He is intelligent and Turkey's best leader writer. Is said to lack tact, and is an excessive drinker and a notorious scoundrel, whose general behaviour disgusts even the Turks.

Dr Arif Bey (Angora)

Born about 1870 at Sarajevo in the Kazan Tartar region, emigrated as a child to Turkey, where he received his early education. While still a youth, was pushed to Tripoli, where he made his escape with Kerit Bey (now Turkish Minister at Teheran) to Paris and France. Studied in Paris, and on returning to Turkey worked as a journalist and was at close touch with Enver. Was a voluntary worker during the Turkish Wars of Independence. Elected a deputy for Constantinople in 1923, and Angora in 1927, when he became member of the Committee of Commerce of the Assembly. We must note that the following statement [illegible] was thought necessary to be published through the Liberal Republican party in 1930: there are indications that this statement [illegible] Government policy, assisted Englishmen. Elected member of the Economic Commission of the Assembly in November 1930. He was closely connected with the development of the Turkish Oak Movement, and was a leading authority upon

Turanianism and the Turkish communities outside Turkey. Re-elected Deputy for Constantinople in April 1931.

Yusuf Bey has at least once visited London, and is married to a sister of the present Turkish Ambassadress there (see under Ferit Bey above). Is a man of considerable culture and some distinction of personality.

Jusuf Kemal Bey

Born in 1878 at Smyrna. Entered the military school but transferred in 1901 to the school of law from which he graduated in 1905. Practised in Constantinople. Was for a short time Deputy for Kastamuni but in 1909 joined the Opposition. In 1910 resigned his seat and spent the following two years in Paris studying law. Throughout the war practised as a barrister in Constantinople. October 1918 to January 1919 was Under-Secretary for Justice, and on being sent on a mission of reconciliation to Anatolia was won over to the National Cause and did not return to Constantinople. Became Minister of Economics early in 1920. In 1920–21 proceeded on missions to Moscow and Lithuania and attended the Baku Congress. Became Minister of Foreign Affairs in May 1921 and thought that his term of office was a close one both with Moscow Proper and the Paris and London standpoint of the Angora Peace Delegation. In March 1922 Rejected in October but eventually re-elected. In July 1923 was elected Deputy for Smyrna and on the following 23rd was President of the Foreign Affairs Commission, which office he continued to occupy until Treaty of Lausanne. In January 1924 became President of the Assembly. Resigned in May on programme question. In November was arrested and taken to Kâzim Pasha Prison for the presidency of the Assembly. Was released and took no further part in matters. His last appearance in public was to read out a message of sympathy from the President of the Republic on 1st May 1925. Left Angora in March 1927 to report at the Imperial Commission of the Assembly. In September 1931 he was the Minister of Justice in the Post-Stresa Cabinet of August–May 1931.

Yusuf Kemal Bey is a good speaker and a courteous Balkan sympathiser but is not very influential as these days he is not dealing with Eastern Turkish matters.

Zekâi Sabih Bey

Born in Bosnia in 1878. A graduate of the Mulkiye School and became Kaymakam and Mutessarif. Was Deputy for Ayintab in the first Angora Assembly and in 1921 was a member of Hekmat Sirri Bey's peace delegation to London. In the following year Turkish economic expert at the Lausanne Conference. Was a member of the Incorporation Tribunal.

Elected Deputy for Aydin in July 1923. Became Minister of Agriculture in March 1924. In September was appointed Ambassador to London. It was recalled early in 1925 owing to his having, on his own account, proposed a direct deal in Mosul which he was instructed by Angora to withdraw. In May was appointed Ambassador at Moscow and in November 1926 was present at Odessa at the interview between Mustafa Kemal and the Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs. Resigned in September 1927 on his election to the presidency of his own volition as Deputy for Denizli. A member of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Assembly. In 1929 when all Powers were obliged by the denunciation of the Commercial Treaty of Lausanne to negotiate fresh treaties was appointed chief of the delegation for the negotiation of commercial treaties. Appointed Minister of Public Works in Ismet Pasha's new Cabinet September 1930 and Minister of National Defence in December 1930 and again in May 1931.

Zekâi Bey carries under a crop of grey hair a perpetual expression of puzzled benignity. He is not a strong worker and a good chief but of so narrow a mind that his story is soon told. He has been reported as being anti-British sympathetic in the past while in London animated Turkish sympathisers by the lack of courtesy towards them. During the negotiation of the Anglo-Turkish commercial treaty he was thought to show the utmost friendly and helpful disposition, favouring the way of compromise. Is no conversationalist.

Zeki Mesut Bey

Born at Aydin in 1889. Graduated from the Constantinople Mulkiye (Civil) College in 1910. Was employed in various financial capacities and twice went to Europe as a student inspector. In 1926 became member of the Council of Education, and in 1927 director of the Mulkiye College. In September of that year was elected Deputy for Adrianople and in November secretary of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Assembly, of which commission he is still a member. In 1929 took an increasingly prominent part in the discussion of foreign affairs as well as in the controversies which preceded the Balkan Pact. Was a delegate to the Balkan Congress at Athens in October 1930 and was elected Deputy for Aydin in April 1931.

Zeki Mesut Bey wears spectacles and has a studious appearance which is reflected in his manner. He is friendly, but not markedly communicative. He speaks French.

E 441 155 93 No. 3

Notes exchanged between His Majesty's Government and the Iraq Government relative to the Treaty of Alliance between His Majesty and the King of Iraq signed on the 30th June, 1930.

(No. 2 [illegible])

Foreign Office, January 18, 1932

[illegible] Note of the 11th instant [illegible] to the Treaty of Alliance between His Majesty and the King of Iraq signed on the 30th June, 1930 [illegible] Treaty of the 13th January, 1932.

[illegible] Treaty [illegible] Iraq [illegible] Article 4 of the Treaty [illegible] Article 5 [illegible] Article 6 [illegible] Article 7 [illegible] Article 8 [illegible] Article 9 [illegible] Article 10 [illegible] Article 11 [illegible] Article 12 [illegible] Article 13 [illegible] Article 14 [illegible] Article 15 [illegible] Article 16 [illegible] Article 17 [illegible] Article

Enclosure in No. 14.

Traité de Commerce entre l'Royaume de l'Irak et la République turque

SA Majesté le Roi d'Irak d'une part, et le Président de la République turque, d'autre part, désireux de conserver et de développer leurs relations commerciales et de déterminer le traitement à accorder dans leurs territoires respectifs au commerce de l'autre partie ont décidé de conclure un Traité de Commerce et ont nommé à cet effet pour leurs plénipotentiaires respectifs

Sa Majesté le Roi d'Irak

Son Excellence le Général Nouri Essaid Pacha, Président du Conseil des Ministres d'Irak, de 2ème Classe du 1er Ordre de Rafidein

Le Président de la République turque

son Excellence Mustafa Sereff Bey, Ministre de l'Economie nationale, député de Burdur

Lesquels après s'être communiqué leurs pleins pouvoirs trouvés en bonne et due forme sont convenus des dispositions suivantes

ARTICLE 1er

En ce qui concerne les droits d'importation et d'exportation, à l'exception des taxes y additionnelles ou de remplacement et des surtaxes prévues à l'article 3 du présent traité, aucune prohibition ou restriction ne sera maintenue ou établie par l'une des Hautes Parties contractantes sur l'importation de tout article originaire du territoire de l'autre Partie contractante, à moins que l'exportation de cet article ne soit également prohibée ou restreinte à destination de tout autre pays étranger.

Il est entendu que les prohibitions ou restrictions d'importation ou d'exportation établies par l'Irak ne porteront pas sur les produits naturels ou industriels de la Turquie qui ne seront pas soumis à des droits plus élevés ou autres que ceux qui sont ou seront perçus sur des produits naturels ou industriels de la République turque ou de tout autre pays étranger.

Il est entendu que les prohibitions ou restrictions établies par la Turquie sur l'importation de produits naturels ou industriels de l'Irak ne seront pas plus élevés ou autres que ceux qui sont ou seront perçus sur des produits naturels ou industriels de la République turque ou de tout autre pays étranger.

Il est entendu également que si l'une des deux Hautes Parties contractantes accordera à un article produit naturel ou industriel de tout autre pays étranger s'appliquera simultanément et sans qu'il en soit fait mention à l'article correspondant naturel ou fabriqué de l'autre Haute Partie contractante.

Les stipulations de cet article ne s'appliquent pas

(a) Aux avantages et faveurs spéciales que l'Irak et la Turquie accordent ou pourront accorder à l'avenir en matière de tarif douanier aux produits provenant d'autres pays détachés de l'ancien Empire ottoman en 1923.

(b) Au traitement que l'Irak ou la Turquie accordera au commerce frontalier dans une zone ne dépassant pas 15 kilomètres de largeur de chaque côté de leur frontière de manière

ARTICLE 2

Les deux Hautes parties contractantes s'engagent réciproquement à appliquer le traitement de la nation la plus favorisée en ce qui concerne les prohibitions et les restrictions sur les importations et exportations.

Toutefois ces deux parties ne seront tenues d'accorder le traitement de la nation la plus favorisée en ce qui concerne la faculté d'appliquer des prohibitions ou des restrictions aux articles suivants que dans la mesure où elles protégeront la production nationale ou végétale.

ARTICLE 3

Chacune des hautes parties contractantes s'engagent à entamer dans le plus bref délai possible des négociations en vue d'arriver à un accord destiné à assurer l'application d'un tarif spécial à l'importation des produits naturels ou industriels de l'autre partie.

ARTICLE 4

Le présent traité rédigé en turc, arabe, turque et française, sera ratifié et les instruments de ratification seront échangés à Bagdad aussitôt que faire se pourra.

Il entrera en vigueur quinze jours après la date de l'échange des instruments de ratification et restera en vigueur jusqu'à ce qu'il soit dénoncé, cette dénonciation ne devant produire ses effets que après expiration d'un délai de trois mois à partir de ladite date, elle devra être notifiée par l'une des hautes parties contractantes.

Si des divergences différend, relatif à l'interprétation ou à l'application du présent traité, devaient naître, le texte turc sera fait foi.

En foi de quoi les plénipotentiaires ont signé le présent traité et y ont apposé leurs sceaux.

Fait à Ankara le 30 Janvier 1932

NURI ESSAID
M. STAFA SEREI

T 1193 146 374

No. 15

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon (Received January 28.)

(No. 28 Confidential)

Sir, *Angora, January 18, 1932*

WITH reference to my telegram No. 1, Saving, of the 11th instant, regarding the signature of certain treaties between Turkey and Iraq, I have the honour to transmit to you the accompanying copy of the text of the Turco-Iraqi Extradition Treaty signed at Angora on the 30th January 1932. The Iraqi Legation, to whom I owe the text of the treaty, beg that it may be regarded as confidential until it enters into force.

2. It will be seen that article 1 of the treaty provides that the extradition of persons who are neither Turkish nor Iraqi nationals is subject to the discretion of the State from which extradition is demanded. Article 3 contains, of interest in that it excludes from the class of political offences crimes against the person of the head of the State or against those of members of his family, and also the assassination or attempted assassination of the head of the Government. In article 16 it will be observed that each party assumes liability for expenses incurred on its own territory as a result of extradition proceedings.

3. I am sending a copy of this despatch to His Majesty's High Commissioner at Baghdad.

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK

Enclosure No. 15

Traité entre le Royaume d'Irak et la République turque

SA Majesté le Roi d'Irak, d'une part, et le Président de la République turque, d'autre part, désireux de conclure un traité en vue de régler l'extradition des malfaiteurs ordinaires pour leurs propres territoires respectifs,

Sa Majesté le Roi d'Irak

Son Excellence le Docteur Nouri Essaid Pacha, Président du Conseil des Ministres d'Irak, Ministre de l'Intérieur et Ministre des Affaires étrangères par intérim,

et

le Président de la République turque

Son Excellence Monsieur Sevket Sevki, Ministre de la Justice, Député de Bursa,

Les susdites Hautes Parties contractantes, après avoir échangé leurs pleins pouvoirs, reconnus en bonne et due forme, sont convenues de ce qui suit :

ARTICLE 1

Les deux Hautes Parties contractantes s'engagent à livrer réciproquement, sous les conditions déterminées par les articles suivants, les individus poursuivis ou condamnés par les tribunaux ordinaires de l'une d'elles, qui se trouveront sur le territoire de l'autre.

Il reste entendu que les dispositions du présent article ne sont pas applicables aux délits exclusivement politiques ou aux faits connexes à de tels délits. Il appartiendra à l'autorité requise de juger si l'infraction pour laquelle l'extradition est demandée présente ou non un caractère politique.

L'extradition aura lieu également pour les individus poursuivis ou condamnés par les tribunaux militaires pour des infractions de droit commun prévues par la présente convention.

ARTICLE 2

Sera considéré comme délit politique tout délit dirigé contre la sûreté extérieure ou intérieure de l'État requérant, ainsi que tout délit connexe à un délit politique, tel que défini au paragraphe précédent.

ARTICLE 3

L'extradition sera accordée également en cas de tentative ou de participation sous quelque forme que ce soit, à un crime ou à un délit prévu par la présente convention, pourvu que la tentative ou la participation soient punissables d'après la législation des deux États contractants.

ARTICLE 4

L'extradition ne sera pas accordée dans les cas suivants :

a) Pour les délits ou les peines tombés en prescription d'après la législation de l'une des Hautes Parties contractantes ou de l'État requis ;

b) Lorsque l'individu réclamé aura été jugé définitivement par les tribunaux de l'État requis pour le fait qui motive la demande d'extradition ;

c) Si l'individu réclamé doit être jugé ou a été jugé par un tribunal d'exception de l'État requérant ;

d) Si l'individu réclamé a été définitivement acquitté, gracié ou amnistié dans l'État requis pour le fait qui motive la demande d'extradition ;

e) Si l'individu réclamé est poursuivi pour le même fait dans le pays requis, ainsi que s'il y a déjà été définitivement mis hors de cause, condamné, déclaré irresponsable ou acquitté également pour le même fait ;

(*f*) Si l'individu réclamé est poursuivi pour le même fait dans le pays requis ainsi que s'il y a déjà été définitivement mis hors de cause, condamné, déclaré irresponsable ou acquitté également pour le même fait,

(*g*) Si les autorités de l'État requis sont, d'après les lois de celui-ci, compétentes pour juger l'infraction,

(*h*) Si, le fait étant commis sur le territoire d'un État tiers, les lois de la partie requise ne permettent pas la poursuite pour un tel fait commis à l'étranger.

Cependant ne seront pas considérés comme une infraction politique ni comme fait connexe à une semblable infraction :

(1) Tout délit commis contre la personne ou contre la liberté d'un chef d'État ou contre celles des membres de sa famille,

(2) L'assassinat, dans sa forme simple ou complète, ou la tentative d'assassinat commise contre la personne du chef de gouvernement ou contre celle d'un membre du gouvernement ou contre celle d'un membre de sa famille,

(3) Les actes de barbarie ou de vandalisme qui accompagnent ou forment un crime, quel que soit le but poursuivi par ces actes ou par les crimes auxquels ils se rattachent.

ARTICLE 5

Les demandes d'extradition seront adressées par la voie diplomatique.

ARTICLE 6

Dans les cas prévus par les articles 1 et 2 ci-dessus, l'individu réclamé et qui sera arrêté sur la demande d'extradition sera remis à l'État requérant, après appréciation de la nature des actes qui lui sont reprochés et conformément aux dispositions de la présente convention, sur la demande de l'autorité compétente de cet État.

Les deux Hautes Parties contractantes s'accordent pour reconnaître que celle que sera appelée à prononcer sur la nature politique ou non politique d'un délit ou d'un fait connexe à un délit politique, sera l'autorité judiciaire ou administrative de l'État requis.

Les frais occasionnés par l'extradition seront à la charge de l'État requérant. Le refus d'extradition ne donnera lieu à aucune réclamation d'indemnité de la part de l'individu réclamé.

Les objets trouvés en la possession de l'individu réclamé et qui pourront servir à prouver le délit ou qui auront été acquis par le délit, seront remis à l'État requérant, même si l'extradition ne peut s'effectuer par suite de la mort ou de la fuite de l'individu réclamé.

Ces objets seront également remis à l'État requérant lorsque l'extradition aura été refusée par l'État requis.

ARTICLE 7

1. La demande d'extradition pour un prévenu ou un accusé doit être accompagnée des documents suivants :

(*a*) Un mandat d'arrêt ou un acte d'arrêt ou tout autre acte ayant la même force émanant d'une autorité judiciaire compétente ;

(*b*) Un acte énumérant les faits mis à la charge de l'individu réclamé, indiquant le temps et le lieu où ils ont été commis, leur qualification légale et les références aux dispositions légales qui leur sont applicables ;

(*c*) Une déclaration contenant le signalement aussi détaillé que possible de l'individu réclamé et tous renseignements susceptibles de déterminer son identité, sa nationalité et le lieu où il se trouve ;

(*d*) Les textes des dispositions légales applicables au fait incriminé, ou une déclaration indiquant que les faits ne sont pas punissables d'après la législation de l'État requis ;

(*e*) Les textes des dispositions légales relatives à la prescription de l'action ou de la peine ;

(*f*) Les textes des dispositions légales relatives à la prescription de l'action ou de la peine ou un exposé des faits constituant la prescription, dans le cas où elle aurait été acquise d'après la législation de l'État requérant.

2. Si la demande d'extradition concerne une personne qui a été l'objet d'un jugement par défaut, faute de comparaître ou faute de défendre, la demande d'extradition sera accompagnée, en sus des pièces indiquées dans le paragraphe précédent, d'un exposé des faits et du texte des articles de la loi sur lesquels le jugement se base.

3. Si la demande d'extradition concerne une personne déjà condamnée par jugement contradictoire, les pièces suivantes doivent être jointes aux pièces à la demande :

(*a*) Une expédition du jugement ;

(*b*) Une déclaration ou un acte d'identité reconnaissant d'une façon suffisamment détaillée l'identité de la personne condamnée ;

(*c*) Une copie du texte des articles de la loi sur lesquels le jugement se base ;

(*d*) Un document établissant que la condamnation est définitive et déclarant le jugement exécutoire.

4. Lorsqu'il s'agit d'infractions contre la propriété, le montant approximatif du dommage causé devra toujours être indiqué.

5. Les pièces produites seront dressées dans la forme prescrite par les actes de l'État requérant et exposées en original ou copie certifiée conforme par le

tribunal ou par toute autre autorité compétente de cet État elles seront accompagnées d'une traduction dans la langue de l'État requis certifiée conforme par l'agent diplomatique de l'État requérant ou par tout traducteur assermenté de l'État requis.

6. Il est entendu que tout en se réservant le droit d'accorder sur la demande d'extradition les autorités compétentes de l'État requis prendront toutes mesures qu'elles jugeront nécessaires par l'application de la loi écossaise ou par toute autre mesure appropriée pour s'assurer que l'extradition ne puisse *a priori* être admise.

7. Dans le cas où la vérification sur la question de savoir si l'infraction, objet de la demande d'extradition, est un des délits prévus dans le présent traité, pourra comporter l'extradition, des explications seront demandées au Gouvernement requérant et il ne sera donné aucune suite à la demande d'extradition si ces explications ne paraissent pas établir que le délit rentre dans le cadre du présent traité. Il pourra également être donné suite à la demande d'extradition si le Gouvernement requérant donne l'assurance que la poursuite ne portera que sur un délit prévu par le présent traité.

Article 9

Dans le cas où l'extradition est demandée par la partie requise de la remettre le texte de l'ordonnance de capture des personnes mentionnées dans le présent traité devra être accompagné soit d'un jugement de condamnation, soit d'un acte d'accusation émanant d'une autorité compétente, soit de tout autre document équivalent, pourvu que l'identité de la personne réclamée soit établie et que le délit soit qualifié de manière à ce que la gravité puisse être appréciée par le tribunal qui doit juger le délinquant. Il devra également être produit un exposé des faits mis à la charge de l'accusé, ainsi que le texte de la loi applicable au délit.

Article 10

Dans le cas d'urgence l'arrestation de la personne requise de la remettre, l'extradition du coupable des faits mentionnés dans le présent traité devra être accompagnée soit d'un mandat d'arrêt, soit d'une condamnation ou d'un acte d'accusation émanant d'une autorité compétente, soit de tout autre document équivalent, pourvu que l'identité de la personne réclamée soit établie et que le délit soit qualifié de manière à ce que la gravité puisse être appréciée par le tribunal qui doit juger le délinquant. Il devra également être produit un exposé des faits mis à la charge de l'accusé, ainsi que le texte de la loi applicable au délit. Cette demande d'arrestation provisoire sera transmise au Ministre des Affaires étrangères de l'État requis ou sur la demande de celui-ci par le chef du poste diplomatique de l'État requérant. Il pourra être donné suite à cette demande par voie postale ou télégraphique et le Ministre des Affaires étrangères de l'État requis en sera immédiatement informé. L'arrestation provisoire du délinquant cessera d'être maintenue si, dans le délai de deux mois à partir du jour de l'arrestation, la demande d'extradition n'est pas parvenue à la légation de l'État requérant ou à son agent diplomatique ou consulaire. Elle cessera également d'être maintenue si, dans le délai de deux mois à partir du jour de l'arrestation, la demande d'extradition n'est pas parvenue à la légation de l'État requérant ou à son agent diplomatique ou consulaire. Elle cessera également d'être maintenue si, dans le délai de deux mois à partir du jour de l'arrestation, la demande d'extradition n'est pas parvenue à la légation de l'État requérant ou à son agent diplomatique ou consulaire.

Article 11

Si l'individu réclamé est poursuivi ou condamné sur le territoire de l'État requis pour une infraction autre que celle qui a motivé la demande d'extradition, son extradition pourra être différée jusqu'à ce que les poursuites aient pris fin ou que l'individu ait subi la peine qui lui a été infligée.

De même, dans le cas où des procédures devant les autorités de la partie requise pour un motif autre que celui visé dans les pénalités entraînant la comparution forcée ou la détention de l'individu réclamé, l'extradition pourra être différée jusqu'à ce que les poursuites soient terminées ou aient pris fin.

Néanmoins, dans tous les cas où la loi permet l'extradition, cet élargissement est subordonné à toute mesure de surveillance ou autre que l'État requis jugera nécessaire pour empêcher que l'individu réclamé ne puisse échapper à la juridiction de l'État requérant avant que celui-ci ait pu le juger ou, le cas échéant, le faire condamner par ses tribunaux.

Dans le cas où l'individu réclamé serait jugé et acquitté ou aurait subi la peine à laquelle il a été condamné, il ne pourra être poursuivi ou détenu dans le pays requérant pour aucune infraction commise avant son extradition, autre que celle qui a motivé son extradition, à moins qu'il ne soit sorti de ce pays après son jugement ou après avoir subi sa peine, ou qu'il y soit retourné de son plein gré.

Article 12

Si l'extradition est accordée, tous les objets qui auront été saisis à la disposition de l'État requis pourront être remis à l'État requérant, si l'autorité compétente de l'État requis en donne l'ordre.

Cette remise pourra être faite même dans le cas où l'extradition demandée ne pourrait s'effectuer par suite de la fuite ou de la mort de l'individu réclamé.

Les droits que des tiers auraient acquis sur les objets susmentionnés seront réservés et, si de tels droits existent, les objets devront être renvoyés gratuitement à l'État requis dès que le jugement aura été rendu.

Article 13

Les frais occasionnés par l'arrestation, la détention et le transport des individus qui auront été livrés en vertu des dispositions du présent traité seront supportés par l'État requérant.

Les frais occasionnés par l'arrestation, la détention et le transport des individus qui auront été livrés en vertu des dispositions du présent traité seront supportés par l'État requérant.

Article 14

Si l'individu réclamé par l'une des Hautes Parties contractantes est également réclamé par une ou plusieurs autres Puissances en raison d'autres infractions commises sur leurs territoires respectifs, il sera livré à l'État sur le territoire duquel a été commise l'infraction la plus grave et dans le cas où les infractions seraient de gravité égale à l'État dont il est ressortissant.

Lorsque l'individu réclamé ne ressortit à aucun des États requérants et que les infractions sont de gravité égale, il sera livré à l'État dont la demande est arrivée la première. La gravité de l'infraction sera déterminée d'après les lois de l'État requis.

Article 15

Si l'extradition demandée par l'une des Hautes Parties contractantes n'est pas exécutée dans les délais prescrits par la législation de l'autre partie, celle-ci sera libre de procéder à l'élargissement de l'individu détenu pour l'extradition. Il ne pourra être procédé à une nouvelle arrestation pour la même cause que sur une demande d'extradition faite conformément aux dispositions du présent traité.

ARTICLE 16

Les parties contractantes renoncent réciproquement à toute réclamation ayant pour objet le remboursement des frais occasionnés sur leur territoire respectif par l'arrestation l'entretien et le transport du délinquant, et par la remise temporaire mentionnée à l'article 11

Les frais de transit sur le territoire de l'une des parties contractantes d'un individu extrait de ce territoire temporairement à l'autre partie par une tierce Puissance seront à la charge de l'Etat requérant

ARTICLE 17

Les dispositions en général et plus particulièrement celles de l'article 9 du Traité de Bon Voisinage signé entre l'Irak la Grande Bretagne et la Turquie à Ankara le 5 juin 1926 et qui ont des rapports plus ou moins étroits avec l'objet du présent traité sont considérées comme en vigueur

ARTICLE 18

Le présent traité sera ratifié par les deux hautes parties contractantes et les ratifications seront échangées à Bagdad aussitôt que faire se pourra

Il entrera en vigueur quatre-vingt-dix jours après l'échange des ratifications et demeurera en vigueur pendant un an avec tacite reconduction aussi longtemps qu'il ne sera pas dénoncé par l'une des hautes parties contractantes

En cas de dénonciation elle demeurera en vigueur trois mois à partir du jour où l'une des Hautes parties contractantes aura notifié à l'autre son intention d'en faire cesser les effets

Si un différend quelconque relatif à l'interprétation ou à l'application de la présente convention le texte français fera foi

En foi de quoi les plénipotentiaires ont signé la présente convention et y ont apposé leurs sceaux

Fait à Ankara le 9 janvier 1932

NURI ESSAID
MUSTAFA SEREF

E 442 35 93] No. 16

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon (Received January 29.)

(No. 29 Confidential.)

Sir, *Angora January 18, 1932*

WITH reference to my telegram No. 1 Savings of the 11th instant, regarding the signature of certain treaties between Turkey and Iraq, I have the honour to transmit to you herewith accompanying copy of the text of the Turco-Iraqi Residence Convention signed at Angora on the 9th January, 1932.

2. Points of interest in the convention are (1) that most favoured nation treatment is without prejudice to the immigration laws of each country, (2) that Turkey can share only on condition of reciprocity in special passport and visa favours recorded by Iraq to neighbouring Arab countries, and (3) that Turks in Iraq are accorded most favoured nation treatment in judicial matters.

3. In communicating this convention to me, the Iraqi Legation begged that the text may be regarded as confidential until it enters into force.

4. I am sending a copy of this despatch to His Majesty's High Commissioner at Bagdad.

I have &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK.

Enclosure in No. 16

Convention d'Etablissement entre l'Irak et la Turquie

SA Majesté le Roi d'Irak d'une part, et le Président de la République turque, d'autre part également animés du désir de resserrer les liens d'amitié si heureusement existant entre les deux pays et de fixer les conditions dans lesquelles les ressortissants et les sociétés de commerce de leurs Hautes parties contractantes pourraient s'établir et exercer le commerce dans le territoire de l'autre partie ainsi que de régler les questions ayant trait à la compétence judiciaire et aux charges fiscales ont décidé de conclure à cet effet une Convention d'Etablissement et ont désigné pour leurs plénipotentiaires respectifs

Sa Majesté le Roi d'Irak

Son Excellence Nouri-es-Said Pacha, Président du Conseil des Ministres, Chevalier de 1re Classe de l'Ordre de Rafidain

Le Président de la République turque

Son Excellence Mustafa Seref Reyhani, Ministre de l'Economie nationale, Député de Burdur

Lesquels après s'être communiqué leurs pleins pouvoirs trouvés en bonne et due forme sont convenus des dispositions suivantes:

ARTICLE 1er

Les consuls généraux, consuls, vice-consuls et agents consulaires de chacune des deux Hautes parties contractantes résidant dans les territoires de l'autre partie contractante jouiront de tous les droits, privilèges, exemptions et immunités dont jouissent les consuls de même grade de la nation la plus favorisée.

E 443 35 93 No 17

Note (Turkish) to Sir John Simon *Received January 29*

(No 30 Confidential)

Sir *Angora January* 18 1932

WITH reference to my despatch No 1 Saving of the 4th instant regarding the signature of the Treaty between Turkey and Iraq I have the honour to report that it has been duly enforced by Noury Pasha that the question of the Turkish claim to the province of Mosul in the case of the treaty not being ratified is as follows

His Excellency has put forward suggestions on the exact lines of the instructions I had received from your Excellency in the hope that the settlement of the question of the Turkish claims to Mosul might be facilitated and expedited but I have not been able to induce the Turkish Government to withdraw their claim to Mosul or to refer the matter to the League of Nations It would be useless at this moment to attempt to argue with the Turkish Government on the merits of their claim to Mosul as they have already made up their minds that they will not withdraw it and that they will not refer the matter to the League of Nations

2 I have the honour to transmit herewith a copy of a note which I addressed to the Turkish Government on the 18th instant in accordance with the instructions contained in your Excellency's despatch No 1 Saving of the 4th instant

I have &c
GEORGE R CLERK

E 447 447 44 No 18

Sir George Clerk to Sir John Simon *Received January 29*

(No 32)

Sir *Angora January* 22 1932

WITH reference to Mr Morgan's despatch No 1 Saving of the 4th instant I have the honour to report that on the 7th instant the Grand National Assembly passed a law providing for the creation of the post of General Commissioner of Customs charged to advise and assist the Minister of Finance in all matters relating to the Customs Administration and to exercise a general supervision over the Customs Inspectors and Customs officials

According to the said law which came into force on the 8th January he is to draw up all laws projects or regulations relating to the Customs and to submit them to the Council of Ministers He is to be consulted in all matters relating to the Customs Tariff and Customs Conventions and to examine and report on all proposals for the conclusion of new Customs Conventions or the modification of existing ones He is to supervise the working of the Customs Administration and to make such inspections of the Customs Houses and Customs Inspectorates as he may think necessary He is to report to the Council of Ministers on the working of the Customs Administration and to propose such measures as he may think necessary for the improvement of the Customs service

to engage if any misunderstanding with Moscow should in fact so far as Turkish policy was concerned, ... while feeling sure that both in London and in Moscow they would slept soundly in their beds (dormaient sur les deux oreilles) I foresee that I was sure that they did in London but was his Excellency absolutely convinced that they did in Moscow The answer was yes, but with the qualification that Moscow was perhaps hyper sensitive and inclined to be suspicious ... all was well, however provided that care was taken to strangle suspicions ... ere they saw the light of day

4 Tewfik Rustu Bey and I intended to return by motor to Bogazd, but weather conditions have been hopeless and he will now leave for Paris and Moscow on the 29th February ... travelling via Constantinople, Belgrade, Szymontache, Warsaw and Berlin

5 Should Your Excellency have received from H.M. Chargé d'Affaires a copy of his despatch No 9 Confidential of the 6th January last, in which he reported a conversation which I had had with Tewfik Rustu Bey, you will observe that when I talked to Tewfik Bey yesterday about the results of the visit ... said I was glad that the Russian Government had been thoroughly enlightened as to Turkish intentions but that these intentions had been misrepresented by Tewfik Rustu's colleagues in Paris

I have, &c.
R. H. HOARE

Enclosure to No. 19

Extract from the Moniteur Officiel du Commerce of January 24, 1932

Communiqué officiel du Ministère des Affaires étrangères

M. Tewfik Rustu Bey, Ministre des Affaires étrangères de Turquie, est venu remettre à Sa Majesté le Roi des Belges les lettres l'accréditant auprès de Sa Majesté en qualité d'Ambassadeur extraordinaire et plénipotentiaire de Turquie. Sa Majesté le Roi a reçu en audience solennelle le nouveau chef de mission et a échangé avec lui les paroles d'usage.

Le Ministre des Affaires étrangères a ensuite été reçu par le Ministre d'Etat, Président du Conseil, Ministre des Affaires étrangères, M. Jaspar, avec lequel il a eu un entretien cordial au cours duquel les relations existant entre les deux pays et les questions d'intérêt commun qui existent entre les deux pays ont fait l'objet d'un échange de vues.

Le Ministre des Affaires étrangères de Turquie a ensuite été reçu par le Roi en audience de congé.

Le Ministre des Affaires étrangères de Turquie a été reçu également par le Prince Régent, Président du Conseil, Ministre des Affaires étrangères, avec lequel il a eu un entretien cordial au cours duquel les relations existant entre les deux pays ont fait l'objet d'un échange de vues

Enclosure in No 21

Sir G Clerk to Sir John Simon

No OT (A 4 Confidential
Sir *Angora February 3* 1932

SINCE I have been in Turkey I have held the opinion and expressed it in despatches and semi-official letters that however low the present Turkish Government may be thought to have descended in the Imperial regard it can be accurately described as the most enlightened and progressive and safely controlled that Turkey has had for 150 years or more but as I have not been able without foreign opinion sent to this country to illustrate the growing sense of safety with which the Government is proceeding to the solution of difficulties which at present attend [illegible]

2 Mr [illegible] Minister of National Defence [illegible] Mr [illegible] Minister of Public Works in the Angora regime married Miss [illegible] daughter of Mr Webb the Angora representative of Messrs [illegible] were married At the time the Minister and Mrs [illegible] were to be present [illegible] Mr [illegible] Minister of Public Works [illegible] Minister of Agriculture [illegible] Minister of Commerce [illegible] Minister of Finance [illegible] Minister of Foreign Affairs [illegible] Minister of Justice [illegible] Minister of Public Instruction [illegible] Minister of Health [illegible] Minister of Communications [illegible] Minister of Economy

and the most unseemly whistles and cat-calls, above which the chanting of the *hafiz* could not be distinguished.

I have heard two theories advanced to explain the state of affairs I have just tried to describe. The first, which has appeared in the press, is that this is the first "grande prière" in the history of St. Sophia at which the Koran and Mevlad have been read in the Turkish language, and that the unprecedented crowd in the mosque was assembled out of curiosity. The second, which is not entirely unconnected with the first, is that they had come to see the Gazi who was rumoured to be coming to the service. (Incidentally, I might mention that he did not come.) Whatever the true explanation may be, there is every reason, as His Majesty's Ambassador's despatch by to-day's bag to the Foreign Office implies, to attach special significance to what may be termed Mustafa Kemal's latest "feeler" towards some form of Moslem revival in Turkey. But despite the claim, which I have read in at least one Turkish newspaper, that the introduction of the Koran in Turkish into the mosques will infallibly lead to such a revival, it will take more than my recent experience in St. Sophia to convince me that this is imminent or any appreciable scale at all events in Constantinople, and that Gazi Mustafa will not find it unnecessarily more difficult than they imagine to clothe up in a new Turkish and independent guise the ancient religion that they have so far successfully contributed to undermine.

C. B.

February 6, 1932.

E 971/33/34 No. 1

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon (*Received February* 26)

(No. 63.)
Sir, *Angora, February* 15, 1932.

WITH reference to my despatch No. 9 of the 8th January last, I have the honour to report that the Persian Ambassador has informed the military attaché to His Majesty's Embassy that the Shah and the Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs were able to settle by short discussion the details of the frontier agreement regarding which the Turkish and Persian General Staffs had after protracted negotiations arrived at a complete deadlock.

2. Sadyk Bey also informed Major O'Leary that the Turkish General Staff had rejected the proposal to divert the Trebizond-Maku road so that it should not pass through Bezirgan on the pretext that the last-named place was situated in a military zone.

3. I am sending a copy of this despatch to His Majesty's Minister at Tehran.

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK.

E 1246/253/44 No. 24

Mr. Morgan to Sir John Simon (*Received March* 11)

(No. 85.)
Sir, *Angora, March* 1, 1932.

WITH reference to Sir George Clerk's despatch No. 379 of the 16th November, 1931, regarding the readmission of exchangeable Orthodox Greeks to Turkey subject to certain restrictions, I have the honour to transmit to you herewith extracts from recent issues of the Constantinople newspaper *La République*, containing further regulations which have received the approval of the Council of Ministers. By virtue of these new regulations the concessions granted to such persons have been implied to the extent that they may now stay in Turkey for a period not exceeding three months instead of only two as previously.

2. It will be seen also that fugitive Turkish citizens who left the country without Turkish passports with the exception of the "undesirables"

[1] Not printed.

and those who were expelled on account of their belonging to the Imperial family, may, after applying for and receiving a certificate of Turkish nationality and a Turkish passport from a Turkish consul return to this country presumably for good. The same treatment will be meted out to both Moslem and non-Moslem Turkish citizens who return under these conditions.

3. A further important concession has also been made in the case of non-Moslem Turks resident in Turkey in that they are now free to travel within the country and to sell and purchase property at will. They have hitherto been under the necessity of obtaining special authorisation to travel and have been forbidden to exercise property rights outside their place of residence. This regulation places them on an equal footing with their Moslem compatriots in such matters, and there seems every reason to believe in general that what the minority clauses of the Treaty of Lausanne signally failed to effect is now in a fair way to being realised as a logical outcome of the new Anglo-Greco-Turkish friendship.

4. The regulations of the 17th November 1931 to which reference is made in article 4 of the new regulations will be found in the "Recueil de Législation Turque," vol. IX, pp. 184-186.

5. I am sending a copy of this despatch to His Majesty's Minister at Athens.

I have, &c.
JAMES MORGAN.

E 1313/70/44 No. 25

Department of Overseas Trade to Foreign Office (*Received March* 14)

THE Comptroller General of the Department of Overseas Trade presents his compliments to the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs and transmits herewith copy of Angora Despatch No. O.T. (A.) 5 (Confidential) of 4th March, 1932, respecting the Financial Situation in Turkey.

Department of Overseas Trade, March 11, 1932.

Enclosure in No. 25

Embassy Angora to Sir John Simon

(No. O.T. (A.) 5. (Confidential.)
Sir, *Angora, March* 4, 1932.

WITH reference to my telegram No. 2 of the 2nd instant regarding the intention of the Ministry of National Defence to postpone until 1936 payments falling due this year in respect of munitions supplied by foreign contractors, I have the honour to give the following details.

2. On the 1st March the Minister summoned the Angora representatives of the following companies:

Vickers Armstrongs, Schneider Skoda, Bofors (heavy guns).
Ansaldo, Cantiere Navale (destroyers).
Chantiers de Saint Nazaire (repairs to the "Yavuz").
Fabrique nationale Liége Gorz, Erhardt, &c. (small arms),

and informed them that as the existing crisis showed no signs of abating as far as Turkey was concerned, he was forced to propose to them that all payments due in the financial year 1932 (1st June 1932-May 1933) should be postponed until 1936. He asked them to reconsider all their principles except this postponement and while not objecting to pay interest in consideration of postponement, suggested that it should be fixed as low as 2 per cent.

3. This communication, as might be expected, caused consternation among the foreign contractors the more so as they were unable to obtain any very convincing assurances that the payments due in 1933, 1934 and 1935 would be

effected on the stipulated rates. Their dissatisfaction is increased by the knowledge that the Ministry while professing to be unable to pay them can yet find money for increasing its own defence and they are astonished that the Ministry has not offered to pay a percentage however small on its debts to them.

4. Mr. Lander, representative of Messrs. Vickers Armstrongs, who has given me the above information, asked the Minister of National Defence whether the decision to postpone the 1932 payments would affect the payment of the £50,000 referred to in sub-Despatch O.T. A/No. 4 of the 3rd February to you. Zekai Bey will be duly giving us professions of satisfaction for the friendliness now prevailing between Turkey and Great Britain and referring to Ismet Pasha's pleasure at this state of affairs declared that this sum would have to be included in the proposed postponement but that he would try to have some part of it paid in 1932.

5. The view of the Ministry of Finance is that the statement of Mr. Wyatt referred to in your despatch No. 72 of the 12th February to the effect that Turkey needs a large sum of money immediately. With regard to Mr. Wyatt's further statement that the reason of the Turkish Government's reply to the American Agency on the 23rd March was solely that it was authorised to allow the report published by certain newspapers to the effect that the Ottoman Debt would be added to a foreign loan of a certain value of £50 million dollars

I have &c.

E 1444/35/93 — No. 29

The Turkish Minister at Washington to the High Commissioner for Iraq (Commercial Relations and Treaties Department)

(Secret and Personal.) *Washington, February 20, 1932.*

WITH reference to your letter of the 4th instant, I have the honour to inform Your Excellency that the Turkish Government have decided to postpone the payments due on the 1st March next on account of the Ottoman Debt, and that Ismet Pasha, the Turkish Government's representative in Paris, who was in Washington at the time, has left for Ankara.

ABDUL QADIR KASLID,
Secretary to the Turkish Minister.

Enclosure 1 in No. 26.

Nuri Pasha to Turkish Minister for Foreign Affairs.

(Translation.)
(Secret.)
Wazir Bagh, Baghdad, *January 30, 1932.*

WITH reference to the conversation we have had together on the subject of the grant of reductions of customs on certain products of Turkish origin I beg to inform you that the Iraq Government will arrange for the necessary legal measures to be adopted for the grant to Turkey of the customs duty at present levied on foreign products on their entering Iraq from Turkey, and for the reduction of the duty on sheep and goats provided that the duty after such reduction or the reduction of one third shall not in any case exceed [illegible] levied within Iraq.

I have &c.
Prime Minister of Iraq.
NURI AS SAID.

Enclosure 2 in No. 26.

Turkish Minister of Economics to Nuri Pasha.

(Translation.)
(Secret.)
Hazrat Chakir Rais, *Angora, January 10, 1932.*

WITH reference to the conversation we have had together on the subject of Iraqi dates.

I have the honour to inform your Excellency that my Government will take legal measures for reducing to one-third the customs duty at present levied on dates and (2) to state that my Government have approved of the [illegible] quota for the date import season of 1932 being fixed at 100,000 tons.

Please accept, &c.
Minister of Economics.
M. SHARAF.

Enclosure 3 in No. 26.

Turkish Minister of Economics to Nuri Pasha.

(Translation.)
Wazir Bagh, [illegible],

I HAVE the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter dated the 1st February, 1932, and to state as follows in regard to the matters dealt with therein:

1. I agree with you that the 10 per cent. share payable to the Iraq Government under the Convention of the Turkish Republic concluded at Ankara on the 26th September, 1926, and ratified by the Iraq Government by their note of the 30th January, 1931, for a period of twenty years, that is to say, from the 1st April, 1931, to the 31st March, 1951 (the date fixed by the Agreement of 1925 and that is, for any reason, other than the expiry of the twenty years, shall lapse wholly or partially during that time, the share in respect of such excess shall be paid separately.

2. Agreement having been arrived at between us for the extension of the period from the 1st April, 1931, for the commencement of payment of the 10 per cent. share, finally the extension period of three years, four months and eight days previously dealt with is no longer to be taken account of.

3. The year 1931 having therefore as the commencement of the period of twenty-one years under discussion (the duration of the grant of the 10 per cent. share), any subsequent to that date (1st April, 1931) from any share payable by Iraq to Turkey becomes out of question.

4. It is agreed that apart from all the receipts dealt with in the letter dated the 24th March, 1931, addressed by the Iraq Government to the Iraq Petroleum Company, which the contents of which were accepted by the said company, and apart from the [illegible] receipts receivable by the Iraq Government on account of income tax, and of the [illegible] fees now in force by the name of "rukus" (or excise duties) and of the [illegible] sales with the frontiers of Iraq by the new company or companies to be formed the right of Turkey to its share of 10 per cent. of other receipts shall be reserved.

5. I suggest that the two Governments should take in hand, at the earliest possible date, the necessary legal steps for the application of Article 14 of the Treaty of 1926.

6. I beg to submit that the outstanding question dealt with in your letter has been settled by an agreement between us by means of a separate exchange of notes.

Minister of Economics,
M. SHARAF.

January 10, 1932.

Enclosure 4 in No 26

Nuri Pasha to Turkish Minister of Economics

(Translation)

Wazir Beg Effendi

I HAVE the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter dated the 10th January, 1932, and to state as follows in regard to the matters dealt with therein.

1 I confirm with gratification that we are agreed that the 10 per cent share payable by the Iraqi Government to the Government of the Turkish Republic under Article 14 of the treaty of 1926 is considered by the Iraqi Government (those payable) with effect from the year 1931 for a period of twenty five years that it shall be paid on the condition (? understanding) that payment shall always, the whole area provided for in the concession agreement of 1925, and that if for any reason one or more years shall elapse without payment being made, the sums in respect of such years shall be paid separately

2 Agreement having been reached to accept the year 1931 for the commencement of payment, after the extension period of three years four months and eight days previously dealt with, it is no longer to be taken account of

3 The year 1931 having been taken as the commencement of the (period of) twenty five years under discussion, the taxation of (date of) commencement subsequent to that date (? 1931) for the share payable by Iraq to Turkey becomes out of question

4 It is agreed that all questions dealt with in the letter dated the 24th March 1931 addressed by the Iraq Government to the Iraq Petroleum Company Limited the answers to which were accepted by the said company and apart from the amounts to be received by the Iraqi Government on account of royalties in respect of the petroleum known in Iraq by the name of 'Naftha' (or essence) and of all petroleum products within the frontiers of Iraq, the new arrangements which are to be formed the right of Turkey, or its share of 10 per cent of the receipts shall be preserved

5 It is however noted that the British Government who is concerned in this question in virtue of Article 16 of the Treaty of Angora of 1926, should be informed at the earliest moment as to whether or not she wishes to take part in the discussions hereto or thereafter between us. Upon the receipt of a reply from the said Government representatives of the two parties will meet at a place to be determined and submit to their respective Governments and Parliaments as early as possible the amendments to be introduced into the relevant article of the treaty of 1926 within the lines of the three above

6 I beg to submit that the date question dealt with in your letter has been settled in agreement by means of a separate exchange of notes

Prime Minister of Iraq
NURI AS SAID

January 10, 1932

Enclosure 5 in No 26.

Turkish Minister of the Interior to Nuri Pasha

(Translation)

Angora, January 10, 1932

Hazret Prime Minister

IN the course of the conversation which took place between us your Excellency suggested for the purpose of facilitating the maintenance of security on the frontier that the two parties should set up at the points where roads and tracks debouch on the frontier and at suitable seasons [illegible] a number of detachments (each) under an officer the strength of each of which should be decided upon by the frontier authorities and the nearest administrative officials of the two parties, and that these detachments should be provided with quick and sure means of communication in order to notify one another and the (public) security and police (reserve) forces behind them of such events as are likely to occur

I have the honour to inform his Hazrat the Pasha that the Ministry of Interior has instructed the officials concerned to adopt the necessary measures for co operation on these matters between the two friendly neighbouring States for the purpose of ensuring the maintenance of security and order on the frontiers.

Minister of Interior,
H QAYA

Enclosure 6 in No 26

Turkish Minister of Economics to Nuri Pasha

(Translation)

I *PROPOS* of the signature to day of the treaty of commerce by representatives of Turkey and Iraq, I have the honour to make the following statements to your Excellency

1 Customs formalities relating to the entry into and exit from Turkey of goods of Iraqi origin passing in transit to the territories of another country or to goods of foreign origin passing through Turkey to Iraq, will be carried out through the Nusaibin customs house in Turkey

I should however add in order to obviate any doubt, that the following clause is added to the Nusaibin customs house shall not prevent import and export formalities and formalities agreed upon previously with Iraq being carried out at the said customs house

2 The three undermentioned customs "chaussées" (? houses) have been opened for the assignment of certificates of importation and exportation of goods and formalities previously agreed upon with Iraq

(a) Fayid customs house for the land and water route Mosul Fao Basrah harbour charges

(b) Ashitah customs house with Kufra as headquarters on the Sharkija, with [illegible] to the Mosul Dohuk Aintab Julemark route

(c) Fayid customs house for the Mosul Zakho Samsat Sarkeh Bazarjik route

3 The change of the above customs posts as may be necessary the affixation of customs seal and signature on transit certificates at the respective customs houses and other matters provided for in the customs laws and regulations of the two parties will be determined in direct communication between the most senior official of the Turkish customs house and the most senior official of the Iraqi customs house

Please accept &c
Minister of Economics.
January 10, 1932. M SAIRAF

E 1625/35 93] Enclosure 7 in No 26

Nuri Pasha to the Chief Turkish Plenipotentiary

(Translation)

IN connexion with the signature to day of the treaty of commerce between (? by) the delegates of Iraq and Turkey I have the honour to make the following statements to your Excellency

(1) Customs formalities necessary on the entry and exit in transit of goods of Turkish origin passing through Iraq to the territories of another country, or of goods of foreign origin passing through Iraq in transit to Turkey will be carried out in Iraq at the Mosul customs house only

To the above should, however be added that the confining of transit formalities to the Mosul customs house shall not preclude import and export formalities and (? duties) temporarily admissible with Turkey being, in the meantime carried out at the said customs house

2) The under mentioned three customs offices are assigned for formalities of the importation and exportation of goods and formalities (? transactions) temporarily admissible with Turkey

(a) Feisakhabour customs house for the round water route Mosul Feisakhabour Diarbakir

(b) Amadiyah customs house for the route Mosul Dohuk Amadiyah Jukerita

(c) Zakho customs house for the route Mosul Zakho Sanat Sairt or Diarbakir

(d) Any charges as may be necessary at the customs posts mentioned above and the general [illegible] Arabic text only) of seals and signatures of transit certificates the respective customs and other matters set forth in [illegible] the customs laws and regulations of the respective parties will be determined at [illegible] between the most senior officer of the Iraqi Customs Administration and the most senior officer of the Turkish Customs Administration

I have &c.
NURI AS SAID
Chief Iraqi Delegate

January 9 1932

Italics re Sect No 26.

Memorandum

Foreign Office

IN the course of the discussion of the extradition treaty between Iraq and Turkey the question was raised of the States whose nationals would be extraditable under the treaty were it to be signed. After agreement had been reached that no distinction between foreigners belonging to the other high contracting parties Nuri Pasha [illegible] explained that the Iraqi Government expressed the desire that the extradition of foreigners under the treaty should be granted for the time being only amongst the treaty states and that while the Iraqi Government would exercise discretion in applying the treaty in practice in the matter, it would favour the grant of extradition of foreigners [illegible] to the Turkish Government in the case of nationals of the States of Syria and Persia as far as such course might be compatible with the general provisions of the extradition treaties

Consequently a clause was inserted in article 1 of the extradition treaty providing that extradition will be optional

M SHARAF NURI AS SAID

Angora, January 9, 1932

E 1520 30 44 No 27

Mr Wagan to Sir John Simon (Received March 29)

No 101

Sir *Angora March* 18 1932

With reference to Mr Henderson's despatch No 14 of the 5th January, 1932, on the subject of the appointment of Naji Sherket Bey as Iraqi Minister at Angora I have the honour to report that His Royal Highness the Emir Zeid presented the letters accrediting him as Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of His Majesty the King of Iraq to the President of the Turkish Republic on the 12th March 1932

2 The speeches exchanged on this occasion do not present any features that call for comment the letter of His Royal Highness to the Gazi and the latter's reply were both couched in the friendliest terms and the cordiality and sympathy of the Iraqi and the Turkish Government during the course of His visit to Angora last May

3 In the course of an interview given to representatives of the Constantinople press on his arrival in Turkey His Royal Highness in reply to questions [illegible] of his knowledge of the intentions of King Feisal to accept the offer of Syria to defend it as a Mandate naturally desired the happiness and prosperity of the Syrians Asked about the British mandate in Iraq the Emir Zeid replied that this mandate which Iraqis have never recognised in principle [illegible] as the Iraqi delegate to the League of Nations in January of last year [illegible] as a result of the conclusion of a treaty of alliance between England and Iraq

Another interview given by the Emir Zeid to the correspondent of the Ulus newspaper [illegible] the case of some Iraqi aerodromes for the purposes of the air service between England and India

4 I am sending a copy of this despatch to His Majesty's High Commissioner at Bagdad

I have &c.
JAMES MORGAN

E 1521 1521 44 No 28

Mr Wagan to Sir John Simon (Received March 29)

(No 102)

Sir *Angora March* 17 1932

I HAVE the honour to call your attention to the corresponding outbreak of sympathetic warfare which has recently arisen between His Majesty's Government and the Turkish authorities in Cyprus. Owing to the [illegible] of the press in this country the public here is probably not aware of its full extent

2 The latest case is that of the refusal by the Cyprus authorities to grant facilities for the Cyprus Company to [illegible] their mines in the Troodos district. The Company's management of its affairs has given rise to considerable criticism in the past, and I am not disposed to question the accuracy of the statement that the Company has failed to exploit the mineral wealth of the district to the full extent of its possibilities. Nevertheless the Company is a British concern and has been established in Cyprus for many years. It employs a large number of workmen and has invested a considerable amount of capital in the island. It pays a royalty to the Government on the ore which it exports, and it has been assured that the Government will not hesitate to exact the maximum penalty prescribed by the Agreement. The observations made by Mr Greig in paragraph 3 of his despatch No 14 to the effect that foreign enterprises in Turkey are driven by the ministers of the Government and the necessity of its chief to preserve the privileges of the capitulations in order to preserve their existence and the effect of this fear which is still [illegible] will be awaited with interest and possibly with concern in many other foreign enterprises established in this country

3 A point of interest which has emerged since the date of Mr Greig's despatch is that a certain Emin Bey the Government commissioner appointed some years ago to supervise the activities of the company as a sequel to Switzerland which [illegible] to the treaty which [illegible] succeeded in accumulating on the confiscated property of his late employers. It is reported that the Turkish Government are anxious to secure his extradition in order that proceedings may be taken against him for his share in the company's illegal activities but as yet it is impossible to say whether they will be successful

4 I have [illegible] Refik Bey the editor of the semi-official newspaper Hakimiet Milliye to reflect in a leading article which appeared in that paper two days ago on the contrast between the attitude displayed towards foreigners in this country under the Ottoman régime and that which prevails in Republican Turkey. Under the former régime bribery was a constant temptation to officials of foreign companies operating in Turkey who could always count on receiving [illegible] appropriate money which would always [illegible] to the Treasury. The Smyrna case, to which I have referred in my despatch No 1 of the 3rd January, is an echo of the actions [illegible] post-war period when [illegible] were now every opportunity to [illegible] the Ottoman Government there should be [illegible] of its own corrupt ways, provoked similar conduct on the part of [illegible] the new Turkey has established a reputation

of [illegible] government. In the old days it was impossible to conceive of business being conducted without bribery, and the article concludes with the hope that the Smyrna case will be a fatal lesson to adventurers of this type, who are bound to be the losers in the end.

I have &c.
JAMES MORGAN.

Enclosure in No. 28.

Queen Victoria Street, London, E.C. 4.

No. 2187
SIR,

Saturday, 16 January 1932.

I HAVE the honour to state that on the 7th instant the proceedings instituted by the Government against the Ottoman Quay Company of Smyrna, succeeding which the assets attached were ordered to be released by the arrest and detention of the following vessels:—

M. "Arnaud," which requires to be docked at Genoa, is being fitted out at Trieste, to start with the next day's specials.

M. "Yasmin," which is under charter to the Egyptian Government, is at present at Smyrna, on behalf of Messrs. Gaffray and Co.

M. "Prince Abbas," which is under charter to the Egyptian Government, is at present at Smyrna, on behalf of Messrs. Gaffray and Co.

[illegible] expressed to me that, whereas the vessels had assigned to them by the Turkish authorities certain work to do, they would have their own working plans at the present time, and [illegible] to the vessels, the charterers would be [illegible] to the Turkish authorities for not carrying out their [illegible] Angora Government, and [illegible] to secure [illegible]

Note on the Ottoman Quay Company.

A Privileged Company was formed in the year 1869 for the purpose of constructing a Quay in Smyrna, and the Company's property and assets were seized by order of the Council of Ministers, the Administration being temporarily entrusted to Messrs. Boyajian and Co. of Smyrna.

The Company represents the seizure as a stage in a well-thought-out scheme of spectacular obstruction, the object at present being the Valuation of the Company's property, with a view to the creation of a Joint Monopoly, and the ultimate acquisition of the Smyrna-Aidin Railway. A series of petitions are appended thereto.

2. Extracts from the grants and contracts by virtue of which the Company claims the following grounds:—

(a) That the Company was debarred by the Turkish Government, which is entitled to 50 per cent. of the net receipts, of its legitimate share (*a*) of the compensation awarded to it by the Inter-Allied Commission on account of war losses, and (*b*) of the proceeds of certain sales of land.

To charge (*a*) the Company replies that Turkish interests have overlooked the question from the compensation awarded of any provision for the losses of the individual shareholders.

Charge (*b*) is contested. It is stated that the land in question was private property owned and held for the benefit of the Company.

(b) That the Company was left free to put forward a claim to set up storage for petroleum.

The Company's grievance in this respect is due to the fact that no warrant was ever provided in connection with the reluctance of the Turkish Government thus to override objections from certain Russian interests in the way of industry and trade, and to create the State Fish Canneries and Steam Ferries were permitted to use the Quay Company's premises to divert anticipated profits by building storages of their own.

(3) That the company is deprived of the use of its books and registers for purposes of litigation.

In reply, the Company pleads that within recent years its affairs have been subjected to the scrutiny by several commissions appointed by the Ministry to report on the outstanding matters between itself and the Government.

6. The evidence on which the charges of fraud are based appears to have been supplied to the Government mainly by two former employees of the company of French nationality named Joseph Arnaud, a Sergeant-Corporal, who had been the trusted confidential agent of the late M. Lazar Gaffray. These two persons entered into relations with the Turkish Government shortly after the Revolution of 1908, and the part played by them is generally ascribed to the hope of reward for services rendered.

7. The Company's solicitors suggest that the appropriation of the profitable services of such persons as Arnaud, the foreign attachés alleged to have been employed by the Government, is a matter which should be considered by the Government in connection with the losses sustained by the Company, and they request that the Company may be allowed to [illegible] its resources, by representations to the Ministry, the advantages of which [illegible] against the [illegible] which would otherwise be [illegible] to the Company. [illegible] Government [illegible] the Company is quite ready to [illegible] the Company's books and documents [illegible] to the Company's books and documents [illegible] to the Company's books and documents [illegible] to

treated the chief members of the Government the heads of missions and other personalities to meet him at a luncheon and a large scale reception was held in his honour at the Italian Legation

2 To summarise the secretes made by Tevfik Rustu Bey during these two days and the lines of declarations that he proclaimed to the press would be both wearisome and pointless suffice it to say that if the object of the visit was to demonstrate once more that Bulgaria is at least one hearty friend in the world, that object was completely attained Nothing could be more fulsome than the cordiality displayed in both sides It may however perhaps be of some interest if I record the impression I gathered from the private conversations I had with Excellency during the few hours for which the full brunt of *[illegible]* was borne almost single handed by himself

3 He certainly professed full confidence in the stability of the Balkan Pact and the Turco-Yugoslav Treaty and spoke in terms of opposed maps of Europe and the Little *Entente* and other such like institutions as being no longer necessary to Turkey I did not attempt during possible to arrange matters by attacking her position in the Pact

What I did endeavour to find out was the object in mind in inviting Monsieur Titulescu to visit Sofia at the same time as Tevfik Rustu Bey was there Diplomatic circles here were somewhat at a loss to account for this sudden visit of the well known Central European statesman the latter's recent political activities in the Balkans and the fact that he was not accredited to Bulgaria Various explanations were put forward by the Press and by members of the Government and Court Public opinion was inclined to the view that Monsieur Titulescu had come to Sofia to see Tevfik Rustu Bey on the latter's way to Angora and to persuade him to use his influence with the Yugoslav Government to bring about the Yugoslav adhesion to the Balkan Pact Another explanation was that Monsieur Titulescu was anxious to ascertain what Bulgaria's attitude would be in the event of Turkey's existing treaty obligations to see Bulgaria and Greece settle their differences by peaceful means

4 As to the object of Tevfik Rustu Bey's visit to Angora I could not ascertain anything definite Nothing of importance was discussed Reparations Cultural questions future lines of action were touched upon and I had repeated the impression that was why the Turkish Foreign Minister at the end of the meeting of the Council of the Balkan Conference (see last paragraph of the despatch under reference No 42 of the 4th February) made a point of coming to Sofia in order to come to a settlement of Greco Bulgarian differences But when the right moment should come Turkey would be exercising all her power to further a settlement of Greco Bulgarian differences Her role being Turkey's friendship for economic co-operation with the Balkans Direct action against Greece would merely mean a further arrangement dictated by geographical and economic conditions and assist Yugoslavia to the detriment of Greco Bulgarian recovery It is part of the world's gain that Turkey has every reason to wish to see Europe prosperous and to be truly realised that the alternative was the sooner or later she might have to reckon with the danger of an integral Yugoslavia of which Bulgaria would disappear as a national entity

5 The point that was brought home to me in this connection was the necessity to assert at this Excellency's view of this danger even while he secretly hopes a possible future to prescribe for Yugoslavia Integral Yugoslavia he said would threaten the absorption by the Little *Entente* not merely of Bulgaria but inevitably of Salonica and of Constantinople Isolated who could say probably ultimately of Angora This gave the measure of his anxiety to see Greece and Bulgaria reconciled It was so great that if Turkey were not so poor he would pay the difference between Greco Bulgarian financial claims I assured to-day That would be the cheapest settling of claims Turkey to right would ever pay

6 Throughout this conversation I suspected suspicion of France and the Little *Entente* appeared as natural to suggest that one of the objects of Tevfik Rustu's present visit to Sofia was to sound him on his standing with Italy My answer was to enquire how the Turkish Foreign Minister was received by the Italian Minister during Tevfik Rustu's visit M Cora was the only foreign representative I met at the Turkish Minister by inviting the whole diplomatic and social world to meet his Excellency

7 On the former visit Tevfik Rustu Bey was stated to have said by Mr Eris Excellency but not say clearly by what he said In the course of a press interview he was asked whether Turkey intended to mediate between Bulgaria and the Soviet Union with a view to the resumption of at any rate commercial relations to which he replied that the Bulgarian Government had not asked for Turkish mediation but that should the request be forthcoming, the task would be one that Turkey, as the warm friend of both parties would undertake with lively pleasure In talking to me this Excellency confined himself to praise of Russian statesmanship But I have a distinct impression that one of his objects here perhaps at the instigation of Moscow was to explore the possibilities of drawing Bulgaria and the Soviet Union together a conception entirely at variance with the attitude described above and at the expectation I have been fruitless for the moment The Bulgarian Government perturbed as they are by the growth of Communist propaganda have no intention of entering upon official relations with Russia as they have stated this to be known

8 His Excellency congratulated himself upon the non existence of any trade disputes between Turkey and Great Britain and he expressed great satisfaction at the prospect of a visit from Mr Simon the early summer He said that Turkey had signed a treaty of arbitration with the United States and intended to visit Washington in the autumn via London

9 Tackling this Excellency went progress was being made towards a settlement of Turco Bulgarian disputes as to the liquidation of the properties of refugees for which commissions had been set up He said that he did not know all the details but understood that a report had been drawn up which would settle the matter Tevfik Rustu Bey however together with the Turkish Minister here Bulgaria to come forward shortly with proposals for the solution of Turco Bulgarian disputes over Thrace (see paragraph 4 of the despatch under reference) on the subject

10 I enclose this despatch to His Majesty's Representatives at Ankara Athens and Belgrade

I have, &c.
S P WATERLOW

Enclosure No. 29

Extract from the Bulgarian Press, March 15, 1932

LES NEGOCIATIONS TURCO BULGARES

AU cours des entretiens qui se sont poursuivis ces jours-ci entre le Président du Conseil de Bulgarie M Mouchanoff et le Ministre des Affaires étrangères de Turquie Tevfik Rouchdi Bey précédé son séjour à Sofia, il a été décidé que le Gouvernement bulgare enverrait prochainement à Ankara deux délégués qui y auraient pour mission de tenir des pourparlers officieux avec le Gouvernement turc pour analyser les rapports présentés par les commissions turque et bulgare chargées d'étudier les possibilités d'une extension des échanges économiques entre la Turquie et la Bulgarie Il s'agirait d'assurer tout développement possible au commerce turco bulgare par le relèvement de la circulation entre ces deux pays

Les deux Ministres se sont également entretenus des pourparlers turco bulgares engagés à Sofia au sujet de l'interprétation et de l'extension d'un protocole annexé au traité d'amitié du 18 octobre 1925 relatif à la liquidation des biens des réfugiés turcs et bulgares La partie interprétative des pourparlers était terminée et les délégués bulgares avaient remis au début de juin un exposé complet de leurs vues sur le principe même de l'interprétation qui concerne la distinction entre les émigrés proprement dits et ceux qui se sont réinstallés dans leur pays d'origine Le Ministre des Affaires étrangères de Turquie a promis au Président du Conseil de Bulgarie de faire examiner incessamment par le Gouvernement turc dans un esprit de conciliation auquel ce dernier a toujours donné la preuve, la question afin de pouvoir procéder à l'établissement d'un texte définitif du protocole dans l'intérêt des deux pays

---

'N 2049 1277 97' No 30.

Sir R Macconachie to Sir John Simon (Received April 4)

(N 39 (Confidential))

Sir *Kabul March* 10, 1932.

ON the 7th March the Foreign Minister had a long discussion on various matters, and before we left he asked the present attitude of His Majesty's Government towards Soviet Russia. I was aware, I replied, that there was between the two countries a treaty which I presumed was the subject which I was expected to discuss, but I was not required with or to have any information regarding it. I would, however, say this much further:

2. As a result of the Anglo-Soviet Agreement of 1921 a communication was received from the Turkish Government to the effect that in accordance with Article 5 of the Agreement His Majesty's Government as the successors of the Imperial Government of Russia were responsible for the Afghan subsidy. I replied that I was aware of the existence of the agreement to which he referred, but that I was not in a position to discuss it with him. His Majesty's Government, I said, were not responsible for the Afghan subsidy, which was a matter entirely between the Afghan Government and the Government of India. His Majesty's Government had no intention of withdrawing from the engagement which they had undertaken, and I was not aware that the Government of India had any intention of withdrawing from it either. His Majesty's Government had always been anxious to maintain friendly relations with Afghanistan, and I was sure that the Government of India were equally anxious to do so. I was not aware that there was any reason why the present relations between the two countries should not continue on a satisfactory basis. Mr Hall-Patch's visit to Afghanistan was entirely unofficial, and he had gone out for his own pleasure. His Majesty's Government had no interest in the matter. I had not discussed the question with the Government of India, but I was sure that they would be glad to hear that the Afghan Government were not dissatisfied with the present relations between the two countries. Mr Hall-Patch had gone out for his own pleasure. His Majesty's Government had no interest in the matter. I had not discussed the question with the Government of India, but I was sure that they would be glad to hear that the Afghan Government were not dissatisfied with the present relations between the two countries.

3. His Majesty's Government had no intention of withdrawing from the engagement which they had undertaken, and I was not aware that the Government of India had any intention of withdrawing from it either. His Majesty's Government had always been anxious to maintain friendly relations with Afghanistan, and I was sure that the Government of India were equally anxious to do so. I was not aware that there was any reason why the present relations between the two countries should not continue on a satisfactory basis. Mr Hall-Patch's visit to Afghanistan was entirely unofficial, and he had gone out for his own pleasure. His Majesty's Government had no interest in the matter. I had not discussed the question with the Government of India, but I was sure that they would be glad to hear that the Afghan Government were not dissatisfied with the present relations between the two countries. Mr Hall-Patch had gone out for his own pleasure. His Majesty's Government had no interest in the matter. I had not discussed the question with the Government of India, but I was sure that they would be glad to hear that the Afghan Government were not dissatisfied with the present relations between the two countries.

4. His Majesty's Government had no intention of withdrawing from the engagement which they had undertaken, and I was not aware that the Government of India had any intention of withdrawing from it either. His Majesty's Government had always been anxious to maintain friendly relations with Afghanistan, and I was sure that the Government of India were equally anxious to do so. I was not aware that there was any reason why the present relations between the two countries should not continue on a satisfactory basis. Mr Hall-Patch's visit to Afghanistan was entirely unofficial, and he had gone out for his own pleasure. His Majesty's Government had no interest in the matter. I had not discussed the question with the Government of India, but I was sure that they would be glad to hear that the Afghan Government were not dissatisfied with the present relations between the two countries. Mr Hall-Patch had gone out for his own pleasure. His Majesty's Government had no interest in the matter. I had not discussed the question with the Government of India, but I was sure that they would be glad to hear that the Afghan Government were not dissatisfied with the present relations between the two countries.

5. A copy of this despatch is being sent to the Secretary of State for India and to the Government of India.

I have &
R R MACONACHIE

Enclosure to No 30

Note of Conversation with the Turkish Foreign Minister on June 22 1931

MINUTION D Minister of the Interior. Minister today and suggested that the Government of India should be asked to point out the Afghan Government's proceedings in the matter of certain

Minister and was at [illegible] in Constantinople.

He had known Mustafa Kemal [illegible] 1921 when he had met him at [illegible]. He was a fanatical [illegible] the original [illegible]

judgment. The Bolshevik doctrines had appealed to him greatly in the form in which they were first presented to the Moslems of Central Asia promising them liberty, self determination and equality.

Musa Djarulla was at one time mixed up with Bukharin, and busily engaged in teaching that bolshevism was in no way opposed to Islam. He had considerable influence among the younger Russian Turks of them with whom he was most closely associated Zaki Walidi, rose to be President of the Tatarstan or Bashgirstan Republic set up by the Bolsheviks. As such he rendered the Bolsheviks great assistance against both Denikin and Kolchak. When however, the Bolsheviks were firmly established in Moscow they began to put down with these former friends of the Tartars and Zaki Walidi was obliged to flee. He settled in Kabul on the invitation of Amanullah Khan. His example was followed by that of Musa Djarulla. He left Kabul attended a conference in the Hejaz as the representative of the Moslems of Central Asia, and had been allowed to do so for the reason given by the Bolshevik authorities. But Musa Djarulla was at heart also a Zaki Walidi was now openly a Pan Turanian and hostile to the Bolsheviks. Emanation of the Central Asian Moslems. Zaki Walidi was now publishing a bi-monthly magazine at Bolshevik expense at the Young Turks and Musa Djarulla wished to get Berlin to publish his part of the Bolshevik rule in Turkestan and to work for the Independence of Turkestan in connection with the Pan Turanian party in Berlin and Turkey.

R R MACONACHIE

June 22 1931

E 1721 1721 44 No 31

Sir Hoare to Sir John Simon (Received April 7)

(No 117)

Sir *Angora, March* 31, 1932

I HAVE the honour to transmit to you the accompanying copy of a despatch from the Consul-General at Smyrna regarding the arrest of Communists at Samsun.

2. Recent arrests of Communists have also taken place at Constantinople, Adrianople and Brussa. Among those arrested Vahda was alleged by the Turkish police to be the chief organiser of the Communist organisation in the Near East and to have made frequent visits to Turkey during the past five years. She is reported to have come to Constantinople at the time of her arrest of Angora and of conveying documents. Police suspicions were aroused by her visit to the supposed Communist Fahd Sali Bey and his friend, who, unless mistaken, studied in Germany.

3. The Vahda Constantinople who was recently in Angora told me that the Communist organisation in Constantinople was supported from Greece, where communism was then among the most influential factors. She said that he had discovered that Greek emissaries had been active in forming Communist cells in that city. The recent arrests in Constantinople was probably due to the recent crisis and to unemployment which was considerable owing to the cessation of visits of American cruisers.

I have &
JAMES MORGAN

(1) Not printed

E 1725 2 44 No 32

Mr Morgan to Sir John Simon (Received April 7)

(No 124)

Sir *Angora, April* 1 1932

WITH reference to my despatch No 118 of the 28th April 1931 I have the honour to transmit to you fourteen copies of the report of the Straits Commission for the year 1931 (1).

(1) Not printed

2 The anticipation that the closest skipping level by the Black Sea Life-Saving Service may be reduced during the course of the year has materialised to the extent that as reported in my despatch No 104 of the 18th March last a Bill is about to be submitted to the Grand National Assembly to provide for the reduction of these lines from 5 nautical miles to 4 miles respectively

3 It will be seen from page 90 of the report that my opinion based the list of tonnage passing through the Straits by way of consideration of the strength of the Soviet fleet in the Black Sea, as far as this information is accurate as can be gauged from the data at the disposal of the commission

I have &c
JAMES MORGAN

C 2930 411 22 No 33

Sir R Graham to Sir John Simon (Received April 13)

No 274

Sir *Rome April 8, 1932*

With reference to Lord Noel-Buxton's despatch No 87 of the 7th instant, I have the honour to inform you that the Italian Government recently proposed to the Ankara Government that the question of the agreement between Italy and Turkey of the 30th August 1921 concerning Turkish territorial waters

2 The Treaty of Lausanne signed on the 24th July 1923 by the plenipotentiaries of Soviet Russia Bulgaria Greece Japan Roumania the Serb-Croat-Slovene State Turkey and Great Britain Ireland and the British Dominions beyond the Seas which depend on the Crown of Great Britain on the one part and Turkey on the other part dealing with the question of the sovereignty of the islands in the Aegean Sea stipulated that the sovereignty of all islands situated in the Aegean Sea shall be finally settled by the parties concerned with the exception of those islands whose sovereignty has been or will be otherwise determined by the present Treaty and by treaties which may be concluded in regard thereto between Turkey and the Powers to which Turkey has ceded islands by the present Treaty

3 In view of the fact that it was necessary to delimit the territorial waters of the islands in question the Italian Government proposed to the Turkish Government that a Mixed Commission should be appointed to delimit the territorial waters of the islands in question

4 In view of the fact that it was necessary to delimit the territorial waters of the islands in question the Italian Government proposed to the Turkish Government that a Mixed Commission should be appointed to delimit the territorial waters of the islands in question

5 The Turkish Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Italian Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

6 The Italian Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Turkish Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

7 The Turkish Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Italian Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

8 The Italian Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Turkish Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

9 The Turkish Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Italian Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

10 The Italian Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Turkish Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

11 The Turkish Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Italian Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

12 The Italian Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Turkish Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

13 The Turkish Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Italian Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

14 The Italian Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Turkish Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

15 The Turkish Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Italian Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

16 The Italian Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Turkish Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

17 The Turkish Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Italian Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

18 The Italian Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Turkish Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

19 The Turkish Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Italian Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

20 The Italian Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Turkish Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

21 The Turkish Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Italian Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

22 The Italian Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Turkish Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

23 The Turkish Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Italian Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

24 The Italian Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Turkish Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

25 The Turkish Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Italian Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

26 The Italian Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Turkish Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

27 The Turkish Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Italian Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

28 The Italian Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Turkish Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

29 The Turkish Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Italian Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

30 The Italian Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Turkish Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

31 The Turkish Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Italian Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

32 The Italian Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Turkish Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

33 The Turkish Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Italian Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

34 The Italian Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Turkish Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

35 The Turkish Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Italian Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

36 The Italian Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Turkish Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

37 The Turkish Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Italian Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

38 The Italian Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Turkish Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

39 The Turkish Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Italian Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

40 The Italian Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Turkish Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

41 The Turkish Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Italian Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

42 The Italian Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Turkish Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

43 The Turkish Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Italian Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

44 The Italian Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Turkish Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

45 The Turkish Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Italian Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

46 The Italian Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Turkish Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

47 The Turkish Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Italian Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

48 The Italian Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Turkish Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

49 The Turkish Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Italian Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

50 The Italian Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Turkish Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

51 The Turkish Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Italian Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

52 The Italian Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Turkish Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

53 The Turkish Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Italian Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

54 The Italian Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Turkish Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

55 The Turkish Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Italian Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

56 The Italian Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Turkish Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

57 The Turkish Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Italian Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

58 The Italian Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Turkish Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

59 The Turkish Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Italian Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

60 The Italian Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Turkish Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

61 The Turkish Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Italian Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

62 The Italian Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Turkish Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

63 The Turkish Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Italian Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

64 The Italian Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Turkish Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

65 The Turkish Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Italian Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

66 The Italian Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Turkish Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

67 The Turkish Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Italian Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

68 The Italian Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Turkish Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

69 The Turkish Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Italian Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

70 The Italian Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Turkish Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

71 The Turkish Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Italian Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

72 The Italian Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Turkish Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

73 The Turkish Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Italian Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

74 The Italian Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Turkish Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

75 The Turkish Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Italian Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

76 The Italian Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Turkish Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

77 The Turkish Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Italian Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

78 The Italian Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Turkish Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

79 The Turkish Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Italian Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

80 The Italian Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Turkish Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

81 The Turkish Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Italian Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

82 The Italian Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Turkish Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

83 The Turkish Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Italian Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

84 The Italian Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Turkish Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

85 The Turkish Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Italian Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

86 The Italian Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Turkish Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

87 The Turkish Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Italian Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

88 The Italian Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Turkish Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

89 The Turkish Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Italian Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

90 The Italian Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Turkish Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

91 The Turkish Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Italian Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

92 The Italian Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Turkish Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

93 The Turkish Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Italian Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

94 The Italian Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Turkish Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

95 The Turkish Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Italian Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

96 The Italian Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Turkish Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

97 The Turkish Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Italian Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

98 The Italian Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Turkish Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

99 The Turkish Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Italian Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

100 The Italian Government replied that they were prepared to accept the proposal of the Turkish Government but that they considered that the Mixed Commission should be entrusted with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question and not merely with the delimitation of the territorial waters of the islands in question

which it was painfully building up a solid credit abroad. It must, indeed, be near collapse, and it might even be that it would justify those who, contrary to my own view, always maintained that it must eventually seek a loan in Paris, with all the conditions of foreign financial control that that would entail.

5. As the Minister for Foreign Affairs was due here on his way to Geneva just after my return, and I should have missed him at Ismid, I went up to Angora. I have not been able as yet to check my constant depressions by the feeling that the capital was not sufficiently great to get on with Ristu to much with regard to the law-suit over which I gave him a brief *exposé* of the financial situation. For my part, I made no attempt to criticise the financial difficulties of the Government, but said that by severe economies we might reduce the estimates of the Ministry of National Defence by a third, the budget would be balanced. He took very well the fact that a satisfactory agreement as to the settlement of payments with the foreign creditors on an agreement with the Council of Ministers would be to the advantage of the creditors. He spoke to Mr. Lamont, who, I hear, then tried to sell to the Government a loan of 5,000,000 dollars, for which Turkey would get, at the very most, 70 per cent. in cash, the remainder in Treasury bills. Mr. Lamont was quite hurt and astonished at the refusal of New York to stand by a deal which would, we thought, be to the advantage of both parties. He appealed to the Government to reconsider the matter after my departure, but the Minister of Finance, Mr. Hilmi, has since told me that he has no intention of reopening the question of a loan on the basis of the budget put forward. He was, however, in favour of a loan for the purpose of the Government's scheme of railway construction, which, strictly speaking, is not a productive one, but which would, in the long run, be of great benefit to the country. I have pointed out that the Ismid-Angora line, which is the only one that could be considered as productive, is the one which the Republican Party have most opposed, and that, as security, it is not worth much more than the paper it is written on. However, we are not to trouble ourselves any more about it.

6. The first result of the Foreign Ministers' visit to Paris appears to be that Turkey will be invited to join the Balkan Pact (see Nos. 130 and 131). You will be informed as follows:

> [illegible] will probably have the effect of bringing about a further postponement of the payment to be made by the Government during the financial year 1932–33 of the sums due to the Ottoman Debt. There is, however, a good feeling that not only the financial situation of the country, but also the whole of the Balkans, will be greatly improved by the Balkan Pact, which, if signed, will be the first step towards the establishment of a Balkan Customs Union. Turkey, politically and economically, will then be in a position to play a very important part in the Balkans, and will be able to dictate her own terms to the Powers. The Government of the Republic, further, attach great importance to the fact that Turkey will thereby be brought within the orbit of the League of Nations, and will be able to count on the support of the Powers in the event of any attempt being made to revise the Treaty of Lausanne.

7. It may then be hoped that Turkey is safe. But the limit of taxation must be very near at hand, and the new taxes which are being proposed for next year seem more likely to arouse the general discontent and to paralyse trade and commerce still further than to produce any large revenue.

I have &c.

GEORGE CLERK

E 1968/70/44] No. 35.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon (Received April 21.)

(No. 136)

Sir, *Constantinople, April 13, 1932.*

IN my despatch No. 249 of the 30th July last I had the honour to transmit tables showing the detailed budget estimates for the financial year 1931–32 as compared to the year 1930–31.

2. As shown in these tables, revenue was estimated at £T 186,702,500 and expenditure at £T 186,582,045, thus showing a decrease of approximately 18 per cent. compared to the estimates of the preceding year.

3. Revenue estimates were considered to be conservative. They were based on the yield for the year 1930–31, which was seriously affected by the world crisis.

4. The results to date have been very disappointing, and it is certain that the total revenue for the current year will not exceed £T 170,000,000, thus leaving a deficit on the budget figures of over £T 30,000,000.

5. The steps taken to effect this result were brought about by a drop in customs taxation, owing to the result of the poor harvests and reports, which have given the impression that the yield of the taxes

6. To meet the deficit during the current year the Turkish Government have had to rely on the following sources, which are also revenue:

(*a*) [illegible] amounting to £T 2,400,000 from funds of the Ottoman Debt;

(*b*) [illegible] of £T 1,000,000 arising on the profit of the Turkish Government on the advance of 10,000,000 dollars which was sold to the Banque de l'Union Parisienne by the Ottoman Turkish Tobacco Corporation, which was the result of the Mixed Monopoly;

(*c*) [illegible] amounting to £T 15,000,000.

7. It is hoped that the deficit for the current year will not exceed £T 15,000,000.

8. With these sources will probably be met [illegible] Ministry of Finance, but I have pointed out that further steps must be taken to balance the budget in 1932–33.

9. In drawing up the budget estimates for the forthcoming financial year the Ministry of Finance calculated that gross expenditure to the sum of £T 192,000,000 would be required, which, by drastic economies, would not, on the present basis of taxation, exceed more than £T 186,000,000, thus leaving a deficit of £T 16,000,000.

10. The People's party, to which the estimates were submitted, has however effected a number of reductions in the following manner:

A total of £T 2,000,000 has been made on the estimates of expenditure, thus producing a total of £T 172,000,000.

These cuts will be effected:

(*a*) By a postponement until 1936 of the sums due to foreign investment manufacturers during the financial year 1932–33 (see Mr. Morgan's despatches of 31st (N.S.) 5 and 8 of the 4th March and the 1st April respectively). This postponement if agreed to represents a reduction of £T 11,000,000.

(*b*) By a scaling down of departmental expenditure and by the curtailment of new construction schemes, representing approximately £T 9,000,000.

11. As regards revenue, the problem for the People's party was to find means of covering the difference between the reduced expenditure of £T 172,000,000 and the estimated yield of revenue of £T 148,500,000.

12. It is proposed to meet this deficit by the following means:

(1) A reduction of the tax of 5 per cent. now levied on imports, which would benefit free customs exemption.

(2) An increase in the transaction, property and transport taxes.

(3) The suppression of certain tax exemptions and franchises granted to national banks

(4) The application of a new tax to be known as the "Impôt d'Equilibre" which is to represent a 10 per cent levy on all salaries of officials, employees, artistes, servants and workmen

13. The yield of the new taxes is estimated to be approximately £T 23,700,000 and the total estimates of revenue amount therefore to £T 172,200,000 as against estimated expenditure of £T 172 million.

14. Budget equilibrium, if achieved by these measures, will only have been attained by a suspension of payment to foreign bondholders by a postponement of payment for arrangements by the imposition of a crushing burden of direct taxation on all classes of the population and by the cancellation of a number of privileges and exemptions the existence of which was instrumental in inducing many Turkish and some foreign firms to establish industries in this country.

I have &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK

E 2033/33/34 No. 36

Mr. Hoare to Sir J. Simon (Received April 26)

No. 16 Secret.

Sir, *Tehran, April 5, 1932*

WITH reference to your despatch No. 91 of the 1st February last I have the honour to transmit herewith a despatch I have received from His Majesty's Consul at Tabriz regarding the delimitation of the Persian-Turkish frontier.

2. The agreements recently concluded between the two countries passed the first reading in the Majlis on the 19th March.

3. I am forwarding a copy of this despatch without its enclosure to His Majesty's Ambassador at Angora (No. 38) and His Majesty's Consul at Tabriz (No. 8).

I have &c.
R. B. HOARE

Enclosure in No. 36

Consul Palmer to Mr. Hoare

No. 17 Secret.

Sir, *Tabriz, March 16, 1932*

FRONTIER reconnaissance: Trebizond route.

With further reference to paragraph 8 of my despatch No. 15 Secret, of the 3rd March, in which I ventured to suggest that Mr. Acting Consul Davis might with advantage visit Trebizond in June of this year, I now have the honour to report that the Turkish consul-general assured me yesterday that the commission for the final delimitation of the frontier will begin work in June—presumably starting on the Little Ararat section.

2. Probably therefore the commission will again make their headquarters at Bayazid.

3. The two tracts to be visited by Persian officers on the Saliras-Provisional frontier and the other on the Erzerum-Provisional frontier would presumably be dealt with last.

4. Zia Bey, who replied to Johnson on the second day of Tewfik Rushti Bey's perquisitions, told me that finally the Turkish Minister had been forced to say clearly that the Turks were in a position of evacuating the tract they already occupied and that the Persians were told that they could take or leave the terms offered.

5. Zia added that the population along the Little Ararat section was pro-nationalist Turkish.

6. I gathered also from the Chief of Police Security that there were still a small number of Kurdish rebels hanging on the confines of the above district but that they could no longer cross into Turkey and should not give so much trouble this year as last.

7. I met yesterday M. Salnavoff, the Russian consul at Makri who had been away when I visited Makri last November. He speaks a little English. He had little to say over the general aspects of the frontier rectification, but volunteered the statement that it would help the Turks to exploit the Trebizond route with comparative safety and that he viewed with future Turkish competition with the Batum-Julfa route with alarm.

I gathered that Turkish transit charges were now only ½ per cent, but cannot be sure that I understood Salnavoff's scraps of English.

8. Zia Bey is going to Stamboul for two months shortly—going via Batum, but he purposes to return via Trebizond. He said that in summer Trebizond to Tabriz could be done in five days.

I then pointed out that recent travellers had experienced great difficulties with the military. To this Zia replied that travellers had to be escorted through the military zone of Erzerum and that in the case of Reitlinger his real nationality had been considered doubtful and he himself was inclined to consider him a naturalised German Jew. This despite his British passport. In any case Zia considered him "a suspicious character" and was "not surprised" that he had been sent to Kars, and in all had been forced to take thirteen days from Makri to Trebizond.

9. Zia Bey added that not very long ago the Persian consul—I think he said at Erzerum—was stopped while travelling to Russia and his baggage searched despite his diplomatic visitor passport. He was found to be carrying a letter to Russia from his Soviet colleague, which letter contained photographs of the Erzerum forts.

10. I do not know what Zia's tone, without comment, but it would seem that travelling near the present Turkish frontier is not yet in the nature of a safe pleasure excursion even when armed with diplomatic visa.

11. Copy to His Majesty's Embassy, Stamboul, and His Majesty's High Commissioner, Baghdad.

I have &c.
STANHOPE PALMER

E 2234/847/44 No. 47

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon (Received May 6)

(No. 151)

Sir, *Angora, April 27, 1932*

I HAVE the honour to report that on the 23rd April, 1932, the Kutahya-Balikesir branch of the Turkish State Railways was ceremoniously opened to traffic by Kasim Pasha, the President of the Grand National Assembly, who was accompanied by a suite of forty-seven persons composed of Deputies, railway officials and representatives of the press.

2. This line which has been built by a German firm under contract with the Turkish Government is 245 kilometres in length. The original intention was that it should be opened in May of last year but owing to unforeseen difficulties which were encountered in the construction of one of the numerous tunnels, the opening ceremony was delayed for nearly a year.

3. The Constantinople newspaper "Cumhuriyet" in its issue of the 23rd April states that the construction of the Salihli-Sivas section of the State Railways has now been completed, the two separate sections having been linked at Turhal. The report adds that it is expected that the line will be officially opened to traffic on the 30th August next.

4. In the course of a speech declaring the Kutahya line open to traffic, Kasim Pasha stressed the military importance of the line which ensured rapid communication between the western and eastern regions. He stated that the total length of railways in Turkey was now 7,695 kilometres, of which 3,430 kilometres had been constructed or purchased by the Government and 2,265 kilometres belonged to private companies. The Government was right in freeing itself from the heavy burden imposed on it by the terms of the railway concessions granted to foreign companies by the Ottoman Empire. Since the establishment of the Grand

National Assembly the Government had never sought a foreign loan for railway construction or granted a railway concession to foreigners. By national effort they had constructed 2200 kilometres of railways in twelve years and the work was continually going forward. He had just heard from the Ministry of Public Works that the Sivas–Erzerum and the Ankara–Sivas lines had now been joined up. Of course, in speaking of the Grand Vizier Pasha and their Excellencies during the railway discussions and their unwavering support, he had in mind the difficulties

I have &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK

E 2235/1541/44 No. 18

Sir G. Clerk (Angora) to Sir John Simon (Received May 6)

(No. 42)

Sir, *Constantinople, April 24, 1942.*

With reference to my despatch No. 142 of the 16th April I have the honour to report that Ismet Pasha and Tewfik Rüstu Bey, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, left Angora for Moscow this morning and that I saw them at the station before they started.

2. I was also able to get from Monsieur Massigli at the French Embassy a few words to see me at Dolma Bagche Palace, where we had been at the opera, before their departure. When I arrived there Massigli told me that he had just had a telephone message from Angora to say that Ismet Pasha was at the last moment unable to see the Ambassadors of the Western Powers, as he had to go to bed with a bad attack of influenza. Massigli had therefore decided to see them himself and to explain to them the reasons for the Turkish policy of neutrality. Massigli was convinced that it was better to be frank with the Russians and to tell them that Turkey was bound by her treaty obligations to the Western Powers and could not therefore be neutral in the event of a conflict between Russia and Germany. He had also decided to tell them that Turkey could not break off relations with Germany at the present moment, as this would be contrary to the spirit of the Montreux Convention. Massigli had also told the Russians that Turkey was prepared to enter into negotiations with Russia for the conclusion of a non-aggression pact, but that she could not enter into any political discussions with Russia at the present moment, as she was bound by her treaty obligations to the Western Powers. Massigli had also told the Russians that Turkey was prepared to enter into negotiations with Russia for the conclusion of a non-aggression pact, but that she could not enter into any political discussions with Russia at the present moment, as she was bound by her treaty obligations to the Western Powers.

3. Ismet Pasha went out of his way to say that he hoped it was appreciated that this mission to Moscow had been carefully thought out and deliberately chosen by the Turkish Government as the first occasion on which they had availed themselves of the right to go into conference with a Great Power under the auspices of the League of Nations. In fact, his own view was that the declaration could not have been made in any other manner. The second reason was that Turkey had to secure certain assurances from Russia before the world Conference of Geneva should be held. By going to Moscow he might obtain from the Soviet Government a statement of Turkey's relations with the Soviet Republics which would be helpful to the Conference. He was going to Moscow to follow up immediately upon the conclusion of the Conference the Soviet offer that Turkey should open negotiations with Russia for the conclusion of a non-aggression pact.

4. On arrival at Pera Mr. Burrell found the Minister for Foreign Affairs waiting for me at the Consulate. He had been unable to see His Excellency on his departure from the station as he was at the last moment detained in the house by the Grand Vizier. He had been delighted to have had the opportunity to pay him my personal compliments. He was now able to present the Turkish Ministers with the flowers which I had intended to present to them at the station. He was very pleased with his reactions

with the foreign statesmen at Geneva and not all content with the effect which he believed his words had had upon them. He had, although he had been for half an hour, his conversation on this subject followed the line taken by the Prime Minister, and it was unnecessary for me to report that length.

5. I might add that, while it was clear they seemed to have some hope of the Disarmament Conference producing results which would at least mark a step in the advance, he was pessimistic about the general situation in Europe. His view, so far as I could understand it, was that a catastrophe was inevitable so long as economic rivalries were permitted free play, coupled because of political considerations. Only if all were brought to realise that the general economic situation must be considered primarily in economic terms would there be any hope. He insisted that only the Great Powers could give this lead, and of the Great Powers only one, Great Britain, had experience and British impartiality and the experience had recently given to the whole world in putting our own problems, the two advantages of no other Power, and he mentioned Europe but the one Power that was recognised as such, the United States.

I have &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK

E 2243/318/44 No. 1

Sir G. Clerk (Angora) to Sir John Simon (Received May 6)

No. 153.

Sir, *Constantinople, April 28, 1942.*

With reference to my despatch No. 142 of the 16th April, I have the honour to transmit herewith a copy of a letter from Mr. R. C. Owen, Welsh the British agent of the Anglo-Turkish Mixed Arbitral Tribunal, enclosing his application for work done by that body from 1925 to its dissolution on the 19th April 1942.

2. Mr. Hamilton is already in receipt of the fees of members of the Tribunal to which he refers, and which is provided to repay every sixty pounds, but I do not see how any payment can be made out of His Majesty's Government funds in accordance with the last sentence in your telegram No. 11 of the 21st April.

3. Meanwhile, you will observe that Mr. Owen Welsh fully shares the doubts expressed by Mr. Hamilton as to the readiness of the Turkish Government to execute the judgments of the tribunal, and it seems clear that His Majesty's Embassy will be involved in a prolonged struggle with the Turkish Government on questions which ought to be presented with full force and by the expert assistance of someone familiar with the complicated matter. I therefore venture to press very strongly the suggestion of Mr. Owen Welsh that His Majesty's Government should retain the services of Mr. Hamilton from 1st May next at the reduced salary of £1,000 per annum, should he accept.

4. I would also suggest, if your Lordship decides to consider the proposal of Mr. Owen Welsh that the £620 less 5% present surplus of the francs deposited should be paid for which purpose Mr. Hamilton's cheque herein should be used to meet the expenses and fees of liquidation, amounts before the Tribunal executive. I gather from Mr. Owen Welsh that there are about forty-five of these liquidations cases, at an average of £7 10 0 for each case, would cover both the fees and the expenses of the Turkish bailiff who will undertake the execution of the judgments, and it should cost at £1 15 0 as at the present exchange about £620. I imagine that the total value of the awards in these cases is about £10,000.

5. Although the formal assent of His Majesty's Government to the final closing of the tribunal has not yet been given, the work of that institution is practically ended and I would therefore take this opportunity to place on record my sense of the impartiality and dignity with which Mr. Hamilton has for six years presided over the sometimes embarrassing and delicate duties of Mr. Hamilton was at times subjected to great pressure by the Turkish Government, but for his firmness and strictness of justice. His Majesty's Government owe a debt of gratitude to Mr. Hamilton, and I was glad to meet his wishes in every respect. I am sure that Mr. Hamilton was in no way swayed

by Angora sentiments and his decisions were dictated solely by his view of what was the just and proper interpretation of the laws and treaties under which he was working but weaker men might easily have given weaker decisions which would have involved heavy charge on the British Exchequer It would therefore, I venture to submit be a graceful and certainly a much appreciated act if some recognition by His Majesty's Government of M Hammerich's conduct of the tribunal were conveyed to him

6 I would also venture to call your attention to the admirable work of Mr Owen Wells as British agent on which I am confident is shared by M Hammerich and Lt Col Hill The physical labour involved in preparing these cases was very considerable and was very ably carried out but apart from that Mr Owen Wells's own great knowledge of his dealings with the Angora Government and with his Turkish colleague and always most helpful attitude on questions which the tribunal was involved

I have &c

GEORGE R CLERK

Enclosure No 3

Mr Owen Wells to Sir G Clerk

Constantinople

sir *Constantinople April* 21 1932

I HAVE the honour to submit herewith to your Excellency a report on the work done by the Anglo Turkish Mixed Arbitral Tribunal from the time of my appointment as British agent (1925) to the final dissolution of the tribunal the 14th April 1932 and I trust, it may be complete list of the judgments delivered in favour of British subjects

2) Although Part IV of my report refers to the question of the execution of judgments I respectfully submit to your Excellency this separate letter offering certain suggestions for dealing with this question

I am to the utmost to events to express my belief as to the willingness of the Turkish Government to abide by the obligations it has assumed under the Treaty of Lausanne I am however bound to report that the Turkish Government as well as its representatives have shown up to the present reluctance to execute the judgments delivered by the mixed tribunal in favour of British subjects In fact although all the requirements of the rather complicated procedure established to this effect have been accomplished by many of the successful British claimants not a single judgment has yet been satisfied

I may add in this respect with the necessary reserve that from persistent although unconfirmable reports reaching me from the Turkish circles of the tribunal it appears that the Turkish Government have made up their mind to follow a policy of obstruction wherever the tribunal ordered the restitution to a British subject of Greek or Armenian origin of real property which has been seized under the Law of Abandoned Properties

2) While fully realising that the task of safeguarding the interests of those British subjects is outside my province I venture to express the opinion that even if there is not any obstruction by the Turkish Government there will be considerable difficulties to overcome from the fact that a great number of British claimants are impecunious and are ill able to disburse the expenses and fees required for the execution of the judgments in their favour

I therefore put before your Excellency the following suggestions which seem to me likely to facilitate matters in this respect

(3) As these claims involve considerable work will be required for a general correspondence in addressing claimants the procedure to be followed and the new powers of attorney to obtain from them and in collecting the judgments and forwarding them to the Turkish Government in order to undertake the execution of the judgments This work requires a good knowledge of the procedure and also of English and I am satisfied in saying that these requirements are fulfilled by Mr C Mavrocordato who has been acting as my secretary during the last six years and is therefore quite familiar with the work of the tribunal

According to present arrangements M Mavrocordato will carry on till the end of December his services may be required for the final liquidation of the tribunal and its secretariat at its present salary of £600 a year

I strongly recommend that the services of M Mavrocordato be retained by His Majesty's Government for the present till the end next at a reduced salary of £300 a year with the object of carrying out the work in connexion with the execution of judgments delivered by the tribunal

(4) President Hammerich was granted overtime a cheque for £620 1*s* 5*d* in the course of presenting [illegible] copies of the "Fraude Dissimulation" suggested that a similar grant should be made to him to meet the expenses [illegible] the amount obtaining the execution of judgments [illegible] British claimants, are that a Turkish trust company should be established for a fixed sum or a small percentage [illegible] work in connexion with them

(5) It will be necessary [illegible] work to carry out the conditions of the [illegible] Turkish Government on behalf of [illegible] and also as early as possible and [illegible] to obtain [illegible]

I have &c

R C OWEN WELLS *British Agent*
to the Turco-British Mixed Arbitral Tribunal

Enclosure No 5

Report on the Work of the Anglo Turkish Mixed Arbitral Tribunal 1925 32

THE Anglo Turkish Mixed Arbitral Tribunal was established on the 29th day of six years was constituted on the 30th April 1926

[illegible] M Hammerich a member of the Danish Council to His Majesty's Supreme Court of Judicature Minister for Foreign Affairs appointed [illegible] equal in his words

[illegible] Turkish Government on the 1st May, 1926 is appointed upon the ratification of the Treaty of Lausanne

The record British accounts were transmitted through the hands of the British agent and by [illegible] the British Embassy at Constantinople where they were finally collected [illegible]

The Turkish Government [illegible] British subjects as their [illegible] Britain [illegible] the part of the Treasure belonging to His Majesty's Government as well as with the British Turkish Government will be concerned with respect to the [illegible] of the secretariat of the tribunal

On [illegible] duties sent to me as British agent to the tribunal I have the honour to submit this report covering the work done and the results obtained

I. *Constitution of the Tribunal*

In 1925 on the proposal of the Board of Trade I was appointed by the Foreign Office British agent to the Anglo Turkish Mixed Arbitral Tribunal

On receiving the necessary [illegible] I proceeded to Constantinople where I arrived on 3rd April 1925 I was [illegible] by Mr H D K Garstin British [illegible] and M H D K Dane British secretary and I presented Mr [illegible] the same day after

It soon became apparent that the Turkish [illegible] adopt dilatory and obstructive tactics in the matter of [illegible] were slow to nominate their representatives to the tribunal [illegible] was left various other questions [illegible] payment of rent and expenses [illegible] was also [illegible] determinable under the [illegible] the tenor of which was protected as [illegible] the

various Governments concerned (British, Belgian French, Greek Italian, Roumanian and Turkish) had to be consulted.

2. It was clear from the beginning that the Turkish Government intended to lay great stress on a rigid interpretation of article 70 of the Treaty of Lausanne which if applied strictly would have debarred all British claimants, relying on articles 65, 66 and 69 of the Treaty of Lausanne, from lodging their claims before the tribunal. A long period was spent in trying to arrange a compromise. M. Hammerich finally overcame the difficulty and induced the Turkish member to sign the rules of procedure by the application of article 95 (3) of the Treaty of Lausanne.

While these negotiations were in progress I was ordered by the Foreign Office and the Board of Trade to proceed to Paris to consult the British section of the Allied Commission for the Assessment of Damage suffered in Turkey, in order to ascertain if any of the claims lodged with that body should be transferred to the Anglo-Turkish Mixed Arbitral Tribunal to be dealt with under articles 65, 66 and 69 of the Treaty of Lausanne.

My work there lasted three months, and as a result all the claimants for the estimation of real property were invited to transfer their claims to the Mixed Arbitral Tribunal.

After the completion of this work I proceeded to Berlin where a conference was held through Office on the 28th January, 1926, which was attended by representatives of the Foreign Office, the Board of Trade, President Hammerich, Mr. Armistead Dalyell, in order to discuss the difficulty which had arisen over the Turkish claims, the Anglo-Turkish Mixed Arbitral Tribunal. Mr. Hammerich explained the way he had conducted the work of the Tribunal and was extremely satisfactory.

The Tribunal began to sit at Angora on the 1st March, 1926. The Anglo-Turkish Mixed Arbitral Tribunal was officially constituted on the 19th April, 1926, with M. Hammerich as President, Mr. H. D. K. Cranston as British member and Djemal Bey as Turkish member.

The Turkish Government was represented by Emin Ali Bey, general agent to the Mixed Tribunals.

During the life of the tribunal the following changes have taken place among its personnel:

Shortly after its institution the Turkish member, Djemal Bey, was replaced by Memduh Bey, but on April 1931 Djemal Bey was again reinstated.

Owing to ill-health the British member, Mr. H. D. K. Cranston, withdrew in the autumn of 1928 and was replaced in November of the same year by Judge W. H. Hall, a former judge of the Native Court of Appeal of Cairo.

The British secretary, Mr. H. R. Dale, resigned his functions in October 1927, and it was then found that it was not necessary to replace him, consequently since that date I have worked in the dual capacity of British agent and British secretary.

4. The seat chosen for the Anglo-Turkish Mixed Arbitral Tribunal, in common with all the other mixed tribunals, was at Tchenberli Palace, Stamboul, in the building occupied formerly by the Ministry of Public Instruction.

It was arranged that all the general services, rent, heating, salaries of servants, furnishing of the audience room, &c., should be borne half by the Turkish Government, the remaining half to be equally divided among the other six Governments concerned: Britain, Belgium, France, Greece, Italy and Roumania. This arrangement lasted up to the year 1930, when the Italo-Turkish Tribunal completed its work and the Roumano-Turkish Tribunal was closed down by the withdrawal of the Roumanian Government, as a result of which the remaining four Governments have since had to bear these expenses.

In order to reduce expenditure it had been previously arranged with the Italian and Turkish Governments that the Anglo-Turkish and Italo-Turkish Tribunals would have the same president and the same secretariat. Therefore up to the end of 1930 the expenses pertaining to the services of the president and the personnel of the secretariat, and also to the housing of the particular offices of these two tribunals were shared by the proportion of four-fifths by the Turkish Government and the other fifth equally divided between His Majesty's Government and the Italian Government. After the withdrawal of the Italian Tribunal these expenses had to be shared by the British and Turkish Governments.

5. The president, M. Hammerich, decided that all claimants must deposit with the tribunal a certain sum in proportion to the importance of their claim, but not exceeding 200 Turkish liras as "frais de consignation".

Impecunious claimants were relieved of this deposit.

Unsuccessful claimants have forfeited the whole or part of this deposit, and the sums thus obtained have been used to meet some expenses of the tribunal. The payment was also instituted to discourage claimants from lodging frivolous claims.

The British Government never had any control over this or took responsibility for it, as it was not provided for in the Treaty of Lausanne, and tacitly left it to M. Hammerich.

There is now a certain sum accumulated from the surplus "frais de consignation" which belongs to the claimants, and which M. Hammerich has handed over to the two Governments concerned, amounting to £620 18s. 5d. for each Government.

II. *Activities of the Tribunal*

6. Since the rules of procedure (article 47) allowed claims to be lodged in conformity with article 70 (3) of the Treaty of Lausanne within a period of six months, and as many of the claimants' letters were sent to all British Consulates, Vice-Consulates and Post Secretariats, it took a long time before all the claims were lodged through the various official channels, and consequently interested parties that had claims to the Anglo-Turkish Mixed Arbitral Tribunal should be lodged not later than the 19th October, 1926.

However, in order to avoid unnecessary delay the Turkish member and the President thought that a period of six months would be sufficient to register the formal notice of the claims, in addition to the three months' notice given in the 19th January, 1927, would be allowed for the actual lodging of the written pleadings. This period of three months was extended in some exceptional cases, as will be seen *post*.

On the 19th October, 1926, 538 claims had been lodged with the tribunal, of which 127 were against His Majesty's Government, 19 against British nationals and 392 claims being against the Turkish Government and Turkish nationals.

The tribunal first sat for trial on the 22nd February, 1927, and delivered its first judgment on the 15th March, 1927.

Out of the total 538 claims lodged with the tribunal, 425 claims have not been proceeded with for various reasons; some were struck off the lists because the claimants failed to lodge their memorials within the prescribed time-limits, some were withdrawn by the claimants themselves when adverse decisions were given on test cases, and some were settled by agreement.

In all these 425 cases the tribunal delivered ordinances setting forth why the proceedings were terminated.

There remaining 263 cases have been proceeded with up to the final stage and judgments have been given in all of them. Although all the judgments appear to be unanimous, as they were signed by all three arbitrators, it is within my knowledge that in many cases dissenting judgments have been put in. This is specially true of the Ottoman claims which were all signed by the Turkish member with reserve. In the great majority of these cases, the defendants raised the issue of incompetence of the tribunal, disputing the nationality of the claimants or alleging that the claims did not fall within the Treaty of Lausanne.

Therefore the tribunal had to decide first on the question of its competency, and when this was decided in favour of the claimants the written proceedings had to be followed by oral arguments and this took a great deal of time.

If these circumstances are taken into account it will be seen that the Anglo-Turkish Mixed Arbitral Tribunal did in completing its work within six years from its institution, has proceeded more speedily than the other mixed tribunals. With the exception of the Greco-Turkish Tribunal which still has several claims yet to dispose of, the Anglo-Turkish Tribunal had before it the greatest number of claims and yet the Italo-Turkish Tribunal which had only 61 cases to adjudicate worked until the end of 1930, while the Franco-Turkish

Tribunal with 149 cases, is still in activity and cannot complete its work at least before the lapse of another year.

The results of the work done by the Anglo-Turkish Mixed Arbitral Tribunal, especially as regards British interests, may be summarised as follows:

(A) *Claims against His Majesty's Government*

8. Of the 12 claims lodged against His Majesty's Government by Turkish nationals (as owners of ships requisitioned during the war), the figures of which were mentioned in the statement of claims, an amount of £5,444 9s. 2d. and £n. 89,462 remain (this total is exclusive of the claim of the ex-owners of the "Hellas Postas" for £2,823 10s.).

In addition to seven purely private claims for the restitution of real property (or alternatively compensation therefor), three of Sultan Abdul Hamid's former properties in Turkey (Yildiz Kiosk, the Valide Sultan's Palace and the Imperial Stables) were claimed by the Turkish Government as the property of the Turkish Nation. Before the total amount which the Mixed Tribunal could have to pay in respect of these claims had been ascertained, it was necessary to decide whether the Tribunal had jurisdiction to entertain the claims.

His Majesty's Government submitted that the Tribunal had no jurisdiction to entertain these claims, which were based on Article 59 of the Treaty of Lausanne. Reliance was placed on the fact that the Tribunal was established by the Treaty of Lausanne, and that Article 59 of that Treaty provided that "Turkey waives all claims of her Government against the Allied Powers to which territory has been assigned by the present Treaty, and all claims of her Government against the Governments of British, French, Italian, Japanese or Russian nationals." The Turkish Government contended that the claims were not based on the Treaty of Lausanne, but on the Treaty of Sèvres, which had been superseded by the Treaty of Lausanne, and that the Tribunal had jurisdiction to entertain the claims.

The Tribunal decided that it had jurisdiction to entertain the claims, and that the Treaty of Lausanne had not superseded the Treaty of Sèvres in this respect. The Tribunal also decided that the claims were not barred by the Statute of Limitations, as contended by His Majesty's Government.

The claims of the Turkish Government to several of the properties mentioned above were withdrawn.

Among the claims against His Majesty's Government were two British claims, those of Mrs. Bateson and Mrs. Rogers, for compensation for properties alleged to have been seized in Palestine.

(B) *Claims against Private Turkish Nationals*

9. Claims against private Turkish nationals are lodged either by the Turkish Government on behalf of Turkish nationals or on their own behalf with respect to disputes arising out of pre-war contracts. The total sums involved amounted to £n. 45,715 0s. 5d. and £T. 51,617 (equivalent to £n. 46,781 6s. 8d.).

Among the claims against Turkish nationals lodged by the Turkish Government against Messrs. Armstrong and Vickers for warships and ammunition seized during the war by His Majesty's Government is a claim for £n. 30,000 and also that of the Turkish Navy Fund for £n. 50,000 against various British shipyards for iron ore and coal alleged to have been supplied.

Among those which have been accepted:

(1) The Bey's Mixed Consultation Tobacco Limited, a British company exploiting tobacco in Turkey, has been ordered to pay to the Turkish Government £T. 5,000 (£n. 5,000) plus interest amounting to £n. 367 50. This judgment has been fully satisfied.

(2) Messrs. Hadfields, Limited, were ordered under two contracts made before the war with the Turkish Government for guns and ammunition to pay back to the Turkish Government the sum of £10,000 plus 5 per cent. interest from 31st October 1926 which the latter had paid in advance. I understand that negotiations are proceeding between Messrs. Hadfields (Limited) and the Turkish Government in view of a compromise by way of a new contract.

(C) *Claims against the Turkish Government or Turkish National*

10. This category of claims has been lodged by British claimants either for compensation for war damages, for payment of debts or for the restitution of property seized during the war.

Among the most important claims of this kind are those of the Ottoman Imperial Land Company (1909)

The vast majority of these claims were, however, lodged by British nationals claiming the restitution of real property seized by the Turkish authorities during the war. In practically all these claims the Turkish Government disputed the British nationality of the claimants and thus necessitated double pleadings, as explained at paragraph 7.

Out of a total of 412 claims lodged by British nationals against the Turkish Government or Turkish nationals 218 were withdrawn, settled out of court or struck off the lists as being out of time, leaving a balance of 194 cases which have been proceeded with.

British claimants have been successful totally or partially in eighty cases, in which they obtained judgment in their favour.

The amounts awarded in these judgments in favour of British claimants are £n. 11,187 7s. 7d. and £T. 27,475 in cash, plus an estimated £T. 127,000 (estimated value of the properties to be restored).

11. In spite of the assistance of the Tribunal, the attitude of the Turkish nationals has been extraordinary. This may be accounted for by the fact that the pecuniary interests involved in the Mosul question were so great that the Turkish nationals were more than ordinarily hostile to the British. Moreover, at the outset of the proceedings, the Turkish nationals were apparently under the impression that the Tribunal was a Turkish Court, and that the Turkish Government could influence its decisions. Many of the claims were brought by Turkish nationals who had been expelled from Turkey by the Turkish Government, and who had left behind them in Turkey considerable property. Many of these claimants were under the impression that the Tribunal was a Court of Appeal from the Turkish Courts, and that they could obtain the restitution of their property. Many of the claims were based on the grossest exaggeration of the value of the property, and in many cases the claimants had already received compensation from the Turkish Government for the property in question.

12. The Tribunal was called upon to hear a number of cases in which the claimants had been expelled from Turkey by the Turkish Government, and had left behind them considerable property. The Tribunal decided that it had jurisdiction to entertain these claims, and that the Treaty of Lausanne had not superseded the Treaty of Sèvres in this respect. The Tribunal also decided that the claims were not barred by the Statute of Limitations, as contended by His Majesty's Government.

Among the claims against Turkish nationals lodged by the Turkish Government against Messrs. Armstrong and Vickers for warships and ammunition seized during the war by His Majesty's Government is a claim for £n. 30,000 and also that of the Turkish Navy Fund for £n. 50,000 against various British shipyards for iron ore and coal alleged to have been supplied.

Among those which have been accepted:

(1) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(2) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(3) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(4) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(5) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(6) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(7) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(8) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(9) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(10) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(11) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(12) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(13) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(14) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(15) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(16) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(17) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(18) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(19) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(20) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(21) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(22) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(23) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(24) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(25) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(26) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(27) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(28) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(29) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(30) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(31) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(32) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(33) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(34) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(35) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(36) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(37) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(38) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(39) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(40) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(41) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(42) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(43) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(44) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(45) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(46) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(47) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(48) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(49) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(50) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(51) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(52) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(53) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(54) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(55) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(56) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(57) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(58) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(59) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(60) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(61) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(62) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(63) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(64) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(65) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(66) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(67) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(68) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(69) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(70) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(71) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(72) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(73) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(74) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(75) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(76) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(77) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(78) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(79) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(80) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(81) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(82) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(83) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(84) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(85) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(86) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(87) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(88) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(89) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(90) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(91) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(92) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(93) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(94) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(95) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(96) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(97) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(98) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(99) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(100) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(101) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(102) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(103) In the case of the Heirs of Sultan Abdul Hamid, it was maintained that the Turkish Government had withdrawn from the proceedings at which the adverse judgment was obtained. Nothing had been heard of the matter by the Tribunal, and the Turkish Government have expressed their intention of applying for a revision of the judgment, no definite step has been taken in that direction up to the present.

(104) In the case of the Heirs of Sult

I give a summary of the most interesting decisions
It has been held that—

(*a*) Article 58 of the Treaty of Lausanne excludes all pecuniary claims for war damage suffered as a result of acts of war. Therefore the provisions of article 65 apply to the restitution in kind (nature) of properties which still exist and can be identified. Any claim for the payment of the value of property which does not exist any more is based on damage and is also applied to bonds, money, letters of credit or bearer banks unless it can be proved that the actual bank notes or bonds which have been deposited do still in existence and can be identified. (No. 24, Ionian Bank, Limited, *v.* the Turkish Government.)

(*b*) The provisions of article 65 were interpreted in the same sense as those of article 55, consequently the provisions being with the liquidation of properties were operative only when these properties still exist and can be identified. Article 65 gives an option to the former owner to restore the property or not to the Turkish public or the right to the national Government to compel the defendants to pay the value of the property if they choose to restore it in its existing state. (No. 2, Rendel, Scott, Hayes *v.* the British Government.)

(*c*) The last paragraph of article 147 does not apply to claims against the Turkish Government based on acts or omissions which were not wrongful under the laws of war and therefore not in contradiction with the first paragraph of the same article which excludes all such claims. (No. 10, Ayoub, Bey, Effendi *v.* the British Government.)

(*d*) Before the outbreak of war with Germany the Sublime Porte declared the treaty of August 1914 to be null and void, and the treaty of Lausanne, Consequently the Turkish Government cannot invoke the provisions of the treaty. (No. 10, Ayoub, Bey, Effendi *v.* the British Government.)

(*e*) Article 25 of the treaty of Lausanne is intended to cover the case of the Turkish property situated in the territories detached from Turkey and becoming property of the new States as a consequence of the cession of territory. The provisions of this article do not apply to the case of property situated in Turkey proper, the title of which is governed by articles 58, 65 and 66 of the treaty of Lausanne. (No. 61, Ralli Bros. Limited *v.* the Turkish Government.)

(*f*) Article 70 (see paragraph 2 above) does not expressly state that creditors are to be paid, but the intention of the parties was quite clear, as evidenced by articles 58, 65 and 66 of the treaty of Lausanne. (No. 61, Ralli Bros. Limited *v.* the Turkish Government.)

(*g*) Article 70 does not provide any penalty for failure to comply with its prescriptions, also therefore the tribunal is not entitled to use its discretion in conformity with the provisions of article 97 (see above). Claims would not be lodged within twelve months from the coming into force of the Treaty of Lausanne for the reason that the tribunal was not constituted until later date. (No. 62, Davis, Sassoon and Co. Limited *v.* the Turkish Government.)

(*h*) By application of the provisions of article 78 all disputes arising out of new contracts including debts fall under the jurisdiction of the tribunal. This includes not only those contracts which repeal (see article 73) but also all contracts concluded after the Armistice. (No. 21, Midwood and Co. Limited *v.* the Turkish Government.)

(*i*) A Turkish national who was a subject prior to the outbreak of war in the territory which became Greek on the conclusion of peace, and who continued to reside there after the conclusion of peace, is not entitled to bring a claim against the Turkish Government. (No. 71, Lazarus Sarafian *v.* the Turkish Government.)

(*j*) An expropriation of the property of a Turkish national and subsequent sale of such property by the Custodian of Enemy Property in Egypt to a British subject is not a transaction which is void under the provisions of article 92 of the treaty of Lausanne. (No. 87, Mohamed Ali Bey *v.* the Egyptian Government.)

to ascertain whether it was a *bona fide* one and whether it was or might have been applied indiscriminately to Turkish nationals as well as to foreigners. (No. 69, John George Pisani *v.* the Turkish Government.)

(*k*) The Turkish Government cannot be held responsible for the restitution of properties situated within territories detached from Turkey. (No. 50, Pauline Dweck *v.* the Turkish Government.)

(*l*) The tribunal is incompetent to examine disputes arising out of contracts concluded after the 30th October 1918, as these are governed by ordinary law in accordance with the provisions of article 77. (No. 3, Mayer Hersh, Sir Sassy *v.* the British Government.)

(*m*) The provisions of article 73 (*f*) apply only to ordinary contracts concluded by the State and which are governed by ordinary law (the relations between a State and its subjects fall under public international law). (No. 84, Noah Bey *v.* the Turkish Government.)

(*n*) The provisions of article 73 are subject to the stipulations of the present treaty and cannot impose upon creditors to give to contracts a validity different from that which they had in themselves when they were concluded. These restrictions (see paragraph 75 Decision conclusion 1) apply to every contract falling under article 73 and can be enforced if necessary by force, provided it is especially stipulated in terms of war subject before the war. (Every contract which has been repudiated during the war by the British Government. Britain's treaties and claims for damages for the non-fulfilment of contracts owing to alleged collusion with the British Government are excluded by virtue of article 58. (No. 89, the Turkish Government *v.* Vickers Limited and the British Government.)

(*o*) A British Royal decree which law was introduced whereby the Imperial Government declared war was equivalent to the British Government declaring war against not only the nation itself but also the subjects of the latter, and that all debts owing to subjects of the hostile country were to be claimed, the debtors were to be called creditors. (No. 84, the Turkish Government *v.* Sir W. G. Armstrong Whitworth and Co. Limited.)

(*p*) Disputes can be referred to the tribunal under the articles enabling it to settle disputes in the event of the parties not coming to an agreement. Therefore a claimant is entitled to enforce a claim (rights are interests) in order to obtain an interest in the rights be possessed under a contract. (No. 105, Miss Dereth Whittall *v.* the Turkish Government.)

(*q*) In conformity with article 61 money deposited as guarantee shall be restored in the treaty agreed upon at the rate current in its country of origin. Consequently a claimant who deposited with the Turkish Government Turkish gold has a right to claim payment to be in Turkish paper bank which is the currency legally accepted by law. (No. 81, Richard La Fontaine *v.* the Turkish Government.)

(*r*) The Turkish law of abandoned properties is an exceptional war measure. Therefore properties of British nationals seized under this law fall within article 65 of the treaty of Lausanne. (No. 511, Mihran Esmerdjian *v.* the Turkish Government.)

(*s*) Cyprus was a British Protectorate by virtue of the treaty of the 4th June 1878, and its practical application for forty years. Consequently persons who were resident in Cyprus before the war must be considered as being under British protection within the meaning of article 61 of the Treaty of Lausanne. Some eighty claims have been won on the issue of competency by virtue of this decision. (No. 339, P. M. *v.* B. M. Pirounakis *v.* the Turkish Government.)

(*t*) A person who was originally a Turkish national and acquired British nationality by naturalisation before the war cannot sue the Turkish Government before the mixed tribunal for the reason that his certificate of naturalisation obtains construction to the effect that he is not entitled to British protection within the limits of his country of origin. (No. 60, Cassimir Bey Agopian *v.* the Turkish Government.)

(*u*) A person who before the war was an Ottoman Greek (French & Italian) who accepted British nationality by naturalisation during the war was entitled to lodge a claim with the Anglo-Turkish Mixed Arbitral Tribunal provided he was a British national at the date of the coming into force of the

Treaty of Lausanne (No 52 Palologue Chryssorallos v the Turkish Government)

(d) A Greek national who enjoyed British protection by reason of his functions of British consular conduct lodged a claim with the Anglo Turkish Tribunal He comes under the jurisdiction of the Greco Turkish Tribunal If, however that person was a Turkish national on behalf of nationals of a country other than the Allied countries participating in the treaties of the mixed tribunals under the control of the Secretariat he is entitled to apply for redress before the Anglo Turkish Tribunal as a quasi British protected person (No 185 John X Xenos v the Turkish Government)

(e) The jurisdiction of the Tribunal is strictly limited to claims which have taken place during the war between the 1st August 1914 and the date of the coming into force of the Treaty of Lausanne (6th August 1924) as between the two countries but not to claims which arose before the outbreak of the war (No 5, Hirsch of Constantinople v the British Government)

IX — Execution of Awards

14 As stated above I agreed to the Turkish Government paying the judgments in favour of British citizens Of these judgments 30 were obtained by writings executed by solicitors in my office and the remainder by the parties themselves The judgments to be executed by the Turkish Government are against 18 Ottoman and Turkish companies and six against Turkish subjects

The procedure to be followed for the execution of awards is set forth in Turkish Law No 1136 of the 20th May 1926 entitled Instructions relative to the Execution of Judgments of the Turkish Government

These awards are to be executed through a representative appointed by the Turkish Government to whom the Turkish Government will pay the amount of the judgment The Turkish Government has undertaken to the Turkish Government forward it to the Executive Bureau in Istanbul for execution

15 This procedure offers considerable advantages from the claimants point of view The fact that the judgments will be sent to the Executive Bureau by the Turkish Government relieves both the latter Government of the right to scrutinise the judgments before execution while the Bureau in accordance with the Treaty of Lausanne and Turkish judgments against the Government cannot be enforced the Executive Bureau will have no difficulty concerning the Department or individuals to execute the judgments if not executed no further step will be taken The solicitor or Turkish barrister must be employed by the claimant before the Executive Bureau will proceed to treat difficulties as most of the claimants are impecunious

Considerable correspondence passed on the matter between His Majesty's Embassy at Turkey and myself, and finally it was decided that when in England last year a conference should be held with the various Departments concerned in order to decide on the course to be followed This was held at the Board of Trade on the 30th April 1931 Representatives of the Foreign Office the Treasury solicitor and the Board of Trade attended

It was decided that a request should be sent by the Foreign Office to His Majesty's Ambassador to Turkey to approach officially the Turkish Government in order to have the proceedings officially recognised by the Turkish Government itself as the defendant

After a long delay the reply of the Turkish Government was received recognising officially the Tribunal and agreeing to the fact that several judgments could be sent to the Executive Bureau for execution None of these have yet been executed

In the circumstances mentioned above all that remains is how the procedure will be applied in practice

16 In the meantime I have sent to all successful claimants copies of the law and of the instruction administrative, and invited them to appoint a local representative in order to press for the execution of the judgments in their favour I explained to those claimants, for whom I was acting heretofore as mandatory before the tribunal that I could not continue to represent them for the execution of the judgments because the appointment of a member of the Turkish Bar was necessary and also for the reason that I should leave Turkey as soon as the tribunal was wound up and my office would be closed

Many of these claimants have appointed local representatives I anticipate, however some difficulties in the matter as most of them cannot afford to pay the required fees and with expenses would amount to about £15 for an ordinary claim

A way out of the difficulty might be to appoint a local Turkish barrister, who, for a lump sum would undertake the execution of all judgments in favour of impecunious claimants his fees and expenses being met out of the sum of £620 18s 9d which has been handed over by the president as surplus of frais de consignation (*vide* paragraph 5) This barrister would work in connexion with some person appointed by His Majesty's Embassy

17 I have already referred (*vide* paragraph 12) to the possibility of the Turkish Government applying for a revision of the judgments delivered in two cases namely the claim of the heirs of the late Sultan Abdul Hamid v the British Government and of Miss Virginie N Kalogridy v the Turkish Government Article 55 of the rules of procedure provides that petitions for revision may be presented to the Executive Bureau within two years after the notification of the judgments by sending a copy of the fact

I may mention that the Turkish Government accept without any reserve the decisions of the tribunal and consider the dissolution of the tribunal as equivalent to the rejection of the claim for further proceedings before it

X — Conclusion

18 It will be seen from the above review of the work of the tribunal that on the whole the results are very satisfactory from the British point of view His Majesty's Government have successfully defended all the claims lodged against it and all the British Empire except two and even also successful in obtaining British claimants awards in their claims against the Government of Turkish nationals

Apart from the question of final result I think the tribunal has also accomplished another object namely to avoid direct and embarrassing disputes between the Turkish Government and difficult and complicated disputes such as arise after a war when the ill feeling caused by the war was still active and thus to facilitate the good understanding of relations between the two countries

19 My thanks are due to the representatives of His Majesty's Government before the tribunal who have cheerfully facilitated by their kind support I have always found in the various Government Departments such as the Foreign Office the Board of Trade and the Treasury Solicitor

My sincere thanks are due to his Excellency His Majesty's Ambassador to Turkey and the staff of the Embassy for the constant kind help they have extended to me during these seven years Thanks to their support and sympathetic help many difficult and delicate matters have been satisfactorily settled

20 President Kaj Humpernick, while always maintaining a strict impartiality and equity befitting a neutral president of an arbitral tribunal, has displayed great ability in casting the decisive vote on many complicated juridical issues involving questions of international law and has shown great tact in handling many difficult matters during the organisation and the life of the tribunal It is thanks to him that on many occasions when the Turkish Government showed signs of reluctance in carrying out their obligations under the Treaty of Lausanne a satisfactory solution has been found

21 Mr Judge W H Hill British member of the tribunal has during his connexion with the tribunal gained the esteem and respect of all persons who came in touch with him It is a great measure due to him that the work of the tribunal has been celebrated and completed within a comparatively short period

22 In conclusion I would like to place on record my thanks to my staff,

which at one time consisted of six, many of whom have been with me for more than three years.

In particular, I would like to thank Mr C Mavroudi, my secretary, who has been of the very greatest assistance to me, and to whom I am much indebted, especially in regard to the Cypriot pleadings, the success of which was in a large measure due to him

R C OWEN WELLS,
British Agent,
Anglo-Turkish Mixed Arbitral Tribunal

E 2236 449 44 No 40.

Sir G Clerk to Sir John Simon (Received May 4.)

(No 151.)

Sir, *Constantinople April 28 1932*

WITH reference to my despatch No 152 of the 24th instant relative to the visit of Ismet Pasha to Russia, I have learnt informally that when he and his party, including Messrs Lutfi and Tevfik Rustu, left Angora for Constantinople on the 23rd instant he was accompanied to the station by the President of the Republic and it was noticed that the usual guard of honour was not present.

2. The party is expected to return to Turkey about the 10th May, by which time the Foreign Secretary will no doubt have been suitably impressed by the warmth of the welcome awaiting him and of the sincerity of Russian feelings towards Turkey.

3. The Vakit comments on the Turkish press in emphasis on the friendship and cordiality which Russia has consistently given to Turkey since the early Turkish days of Turkey's fight for independence and on the harmony of aims and interests existing between the two countries. It points out that, although it is the first time that a Turkish Prime Minister pays a visit to Russia, a visit which further cements existing friendly relations between Russia and Turkey, it is not to be misunderstood as implying any change in Turkey's attitude towards Western Governments and must not be taken to mean that Turkey is about to change her relations with Russia which are entirely unconnected with those with Western nations.

4. I have the honour to inform you that, as stated in my despatch No 358 of the 31st November 1931, which was then going, M Litvinoff's stay in Angora at the end of October 1931, included an invitation that a return visit should be paid to Moscow in the near future and that the exchange of visits between the two countries, which seems likely to become a fixed and periodic institution, bears witness to the friendly relationship prevailing between the two countries without having on any occasion necessitated any particular negotiations.

5. I am sending a copy of this despatch to His Majesty's representative at Moscow.

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK

E 2271 449 44 No 41.

Mr Strang to Sir John Simon (Received May 8.)

(No 69.)

(Telegraphic.) R *Moscow May 8 1932*

OFFICIAL communique was published this morning reviewing results of Ismet Pasha's visit.

Visit has, it states shown that policy of close collaboration in the past has been fully justified and that both world situation and interests of parties require that such collaboration should be further developed.

Similarity of economic and industrial problems facing the two countries is conducive to more effective contact and to agreement of principle has been reached on steps to be taken for this purpose. With this object Soviet Government have opened a long-term credit to enable Turkey to obtain Soviet orders to be repaid in kind by yearly instalments for a quantity of latest type of machinery of Soviet manufacture."

E 2381 449 44 No 42.

Mr Strang to Sir John Simon (Received May 17.)

(No 231.)

Sir, *Moscow, May 3, 1932*

I HAVE the honour to report that Ismet Pasha and Tevfik Rustu Bey, accompanied by their wives and a large party of other Turkish notables, arrived at Odessa on the morning of the 26th April on an official visit to the Soviet Union. The party included in addition to the persons enumerated in Sir George Clerk's despatch No 112 of the 26th April Ismet Pasha's second son and nephew, Ilyas Bey and Hasan Bey and Hasan Esat Bey, details of whom are attached to the Despatch of Consul-General Kelly from Odessa dated the 28th April. The party was accompanied by M Surits, Soviet Ambassador at Angora, and was met at Odessa by Hussein Ragip Bey, Turkish Ambassador at Moscow, and a number of Soviet officials. The Soviet steamer Gruzia with Ismet Pasha's party on board was escorted into port by three fighting planes which circled round the steamer. On landing Ismet Pasha inspected the guard of honour and greeted them in Russian. The party were then entertained to a banquet at the Hotel Passage, after which they left by special train for Moscow at 8.45 p.m. on the same day.

2. The reception at Odessa was the largest and most public of the Odessa Executive Committee's functions for many years, and all the notables in the town were present at the banquet in the hotel. It is said that the Turkish visitors were much impressed by the reception, which was also remarkable for the absence of anti-Turkish demonstrations, and by the fact that the Soviet authorities were prepared to allow a free display of Turkish nationalism. The Turkish Ambassador at Moscow, who had been sent to Odessa to represent the Turkish Government, was the only person present who could speak both languages, and he was thus able to act as interpreter between the two parties. It was the first occasion on which he had met Ismet Pasha since the latter's resignation of the Turkish Premiership in October 1930, and the meeting between the two statesmen after this interval was apparently a most cordial one.

3. The party arrived at Moscow on the morning of the 28th April. M Molotov, Minister of the Council of Peoples Commissars, M Litvinov, Commissar for Foreign Affairs, and other high officials were present to welcome the guests at the station. The Turkish Ambassador at Moscow and the foreign representatives in Moscow were also present at the station. The two Ministers were accommodated in the Grand Hotel, which is reported to be the Foreign Affairs Commissariat's official hotel for distinguished foreign visitors. The Turkish Ambassador also stayed at the hotel, but on account of the fact that Ismet Pasha and Tevfik Rustu Bey paid visits to M Kalinin, President of the Central Executive Committee, and to M Molotov and M Litvinov, and had a wreath laid at the tomb at the Mausoleum in the Red Square. Groups of the Turkish party visited the Commissariats of Heavy Industry, Light Industry, Supply, Foreign Trade, Agriculture, Education, and Health.

4. On the evening of the 29th April M Molotov gave a banquet for the Turkish guests which was attended by the chief Soviet notables. The dinner was followed by a reception to which the staffs of foreign missions and their wives, foreign press correspondents, and members of Soviet officials were invited. The men wore full dress, the women evening dress. The reception was, on this occasion, for the first time held in the Kremlin palace itself in the Hall of St George, a great hall of white marble reached by a long straight staircase, on the upper landing of which stand large pictures of Alexander III and his consort. The names and arms of the Knights of St George are graven on the stone pillars and pillars of the hall. The reception was a rather dreary affair. The hall was much too big for the 500 or so people invited. A good many of the guests arrived before the hosts had finished dinner and M Molotov, who, it is said, is more strict on matters of protocol than his predecessor M Rykov, made the attempt to establish contact with his guests other than the Turks. Many more Soviet officials than usual were invited but except for the few whether Commissars, Foreign Commissariat officials or theatrical managers, who were stationed to meet Ismet Pasha as they kept to themselves either walking round the hall or sitting on a settee to look on the fringes of the dancers or congregating in groups at the sides of the hall. Here was little to see. Supper was served in the former Hall of St Andrew, a larger and more ornate version of the Foreign Office decorated in red and white and gold. The

supper was of the stock Moscow type, plentiful and well presented, but, apart from the caviare, not very appetising.

5. The speeches delivered by M. Molotov and Ismet Pasha at the banquet were of no special note. Molotov stressed the importance of the occasion, the establishment of personal contact with the Prime Minister of a friendly country accompanied by a large and representative delegation. Soviet-Turkish friendship was of historic importance, established at a time when both countries were struggling for independence and existence against the forces of imperialism and now tested and reinforced by twelve years' experience and fortified by repeated personal contacts between the political leaders. The Soviet-Turkish Treaty of 1925 was a model of a new type of pact of neutrality and non-aggression which could be developed and would strengthen its standing as a model for others. Notwithstanding the differences in the social and economic systems of the two countries, creative relations would continue to be strengthened. The exchange of views had made possible a better understanding of the present situation and had contributed to the consolidation of peace. Soviet-Turkish friendship was a decisive factor in the maintenance of peace and a reliable and powerful support in the world. He concluded with compliments and toasts.

6. In his reply, Ismet Pasha said that he was grateful for the warm and cordial welcome and would carry away the impression of friendship behind received. He spoke briefly of the visit to Ankara in the autumn of last year by the late M. Molotov, and of the pleasure with which he had received the present delegation. Yunus Nadi Bey and Rustu Esref Bey, who were well known to be powerfully representative of Turkish industry and commerce, had just been to Dnieprostroi, Stalingrad and Leningrad and had seen for themselves the great progress which had been made in the Soviet Union since the visit of Ismet Pasha to Moscow in 1934. He was sure that the present visit would make for a further development of Soviet-Turkish friendship and he proposed a toast to the health of Stalin, to the prosperity of the Soviet Union and to the friendship between the Soviet Union and Turkey.

7. The next day, Stalin gave a banquet to the Turkish delegation at the Kremlin, which was attended by the Turkish Ambassador and the staff of the Turkish Embassy, the Soviet Government, the Turkish party and the Soviet Ambassador in Ankara. Stalin's speech was a long one, and I have not yet received a full translation of it. He began by saying that the Soviet Government had been convinced that the present visit would make for a further development of Soviet-Turkish friendship and he referred to the long visit of Ismet Pasha to Moscow in 1934. He then went on to say that the two countries had no territorial disputes between them. Their relations were based on mutual confidence and respect for each other's interests. Turkey had not been subjected to aggression by the Soviet Union and had no reason to fear it. Soviet Russia had no intention of violating the territorial integrity of Turkey. Stalin then referred to the Montreux Convention, which he said was not directed against any country, but was designed to safeguard the Straits from the danger of war. He concluded with a toast to the health of Ismet Pasha, saying: "As an old soldier I know that however far military technique may advance, the essential element in war is the man. The Soviet and Turkish people are inspired by the great ideals of revolution and peace, and are, therefore, unconquerable. I am firmly convinced that if it should come to a military conflict, the Red Army would be victorious."

8. In the evening there was a Soviet-Turkish dinner at the Turkish Embassy, followed by a reception for the staffs of foreign missions and others. This was, I believe, M. Molotov's first appearance at a foreign Embassy.

9. The whole Turkish delegation witnessed the May Day parade in the Red Square from a special stand, and, unlike the rest of us, remained for the whole of the demonstrations which followed the parade. They must have been on their feet for nearly five hours. Later in the day Ismet Pasha attended a reception organised by the All Union Chamber of Commerce. He told the company that he rejoiced to see the successes achieved by the Soviet Union in the economic and cultural field, and that he could also, for his part, give an account of Turkish progress which, in spite of differences of scale, would equally regale his hearers. Soviet-Turkish relations should be developed in the cultural, technical and commercial as well as the political sphere. It could not, however, be denied that neighbourly relations, though not necessarily selfish ones, always desire to utilise Soviet achievements in the development of Turkish national territory. Soviet industry had already learnt to produce excellent goods which Turkey would prefer to take from Soviet Russia rather than abroad. There was no reason why commercial relations should not be successfully developed.

10. A reception was given by the Tass Agency for the Turkish journalists and for local writers accompanying the delegation. Yunus Nadi Bey and Rustu Esref Bey, who were well known to be powerfully representative of Turkish industry and commerce, had just been to Dnieprostroi, Stalingrad and Leningrad and had seen for themselves the great progress which had been made in the Soviet Union since the visit of Ismet Pasha to Moscow in 1934. He was sure that the present visit would make for a further development of Soviet-Turkish friendship and he proposed a toast to the health of Stalin, to the prosperity of the Soviet Union and to the friendship between the Soviet Union and Turkey.

11. On the evening of the 1st May the British Ambassador gave a dinner for the Soviet and Turkish personalities, followed by a reception attended by a number of foreign missions. The Ambassador's reason for giving this dinner was that Ismet Pasha was shortly to visit Rome. Some people, I understand, seriously pointed to the possibility of Soviet-Turkish, British solidarity.

12. On the following day the Turkish party witnessed a gymnastic display followed by a football match in the Stadium of the Dinamo (C.P.U.) Sporting Club. In the evening they were taken to the ballet. On the evening of the 3rd May they left for Leningrad.

13. Feyik Rustu let me feel that Ismet's visit was simply one of friendship and that, as he and his colleagues had not been to Moscow for many years, it was valuable to exchange views at first hand on problems of the day and that this was what they were doing. The German Ambassador told me that M. Merekalov spoke to him in similar vein a week or two ago. I had a short talk with Ismet Pasha, who seemed at that particular moment to be more interested in the Far Eastern situation than in anything else.

14. Feyik Rustu was rather less talkative than when he was here in 1930. Ismet Pasha came through his rather trying ordeal with dignified courtesy. Mme. Ismet was unfortunately ill for a good part of the visit. The licensed gossip of the Commissariat for Foreign Affairs told me that of the Turkish party they found Feyik Rustu and the Ambassador best as being people with whom it was possible to talk. They found Ismet rather unresponsive and rustically aloof (a real Inönü type!) and I suppose not sufficiently impressed with their new world.

15. As may be gathered from the above, the Soviet Government have spared no pains to do honour to their guests. The Russians I should imagine attach more importance to the relations between the two countries than do the Turks. For Turkey Russia is a make weight, for Russia Turkey is an only friend. If Turkey were able to become a member of the League of Nations it would be well that she should make a reassuring demonstration of unity to her friend in the other camp. Russia, for her part, is in real or imagined danger of an attack upon her rights and interests in Manchuria or upon her territorial integrity in the Far East and is suffering from a more than usually violent attack of nerves at the prospect of an attack from the West. The value of Turkey to Soviet Russia is to the extent that she is a Power who geographically and racially and by the very character of her political relations with other countries can be confidently counted on either to engage in or to become involved by force of circumstances in anti-Soviet political or even military combinations.

10 The Soviet view of the visit was stated in a leading article in the official Izvestiya on the 25th April a translation of which is enclosed in my immediately following despatch. The visit of Ismet Pasha differs, apparently, from the ordinary run of visits among imperialist statesmen in that while the latter are but stages on the road to the preparation of a new world war and an attack on the Soviet Union it represents a stage in the struggle for peace. After drawing the parallel between the early history of the two regimes and recalling their mutual aid in their fight for independence against the imperialists in the early days of their existence the article goes on to say that the Soviet Union and an independent nationalist Turkey are each in their own way obstacles to the fulfilment of imperialist plans. The imperialist States have therefore formed groups of a military character the object of which is to destroy not only the Soviet Union but also nationally independent States of the East. They are spurring on Japan to attack the Soviet Union to break the connexion between the proletarian revolution in Europe and the nationalist movement in the East of which Soviet Turkish friendship is a symbol. The result of Ismet Pasha's visit will be to strengthen that friendship and serve the cause of peace.

20 I have sent a copy of this despatch to His Majesty's Ambassador at Angora.

I have &c.
WILLIAM STRANG.

E 2383 449 44 No. 43

Sir R. Clay to Sir John Simon (*Received May 17*)

(No. 241)

Sir, *Moscow, May 9, 1932*

With reference to Mr. Strang's despatch No. 240 of the 6th May I have the honour to report that Ismet Pasha and his party returned to Moscow from Leningrad on the 6th May and left Moscow on the night of the 7th May for Sebastopol where they embarked in a steamer. M. Molotov went to the station to see them off and M. Litvinov and members of his staff accompanied them to Sebastopol.

2 Enclosure 1 is a Memorandum by Mr. Hallard of proceedings at Leningrad.

3 The results of Ismet Pasha's visit were as reported in my telegram No. 69 of the 8th May reviewed in an official statement published here on the 8th May. This statement was as follows:

> 'During his stay in the U.S.S.R. the President of the Council of Ministers of the Turkish Republic Ismet Pasha and the Minister for Foreign Affairs Tevfik Rouchti Bey who accompanied him had repeated conversations with all the responsible leaders of the Soviet Government. The respective Ambassadors were present at the meetings.
>
> 'These conversations were of an extremely cordial and friendly character and permitted extensive consideration not only of the international problems of interest to the two countries but also of questions relating to their direct relations with each other. A complete community of view was established permitting it to be agreed that the policy of close collaboration between the two countries as it had fully justified itself and that the general international situation and the interests of world peace made it necessary not merely to maintain but to extend that collaboration.
>
> 'Special attention was paid to the problem of the economic and cultural connexions between Turkey and the U.S.S.R. The personal acquaintance of the Turkish visitors with the progress of construction now proceeding in the U.S.S.R. and with the work of Soviet economic organs interested in many cases a great similarity in the problems facing both countries in these spheres and the practical possibility of a much more extensive and more effective contact.
>
> 'An agreement in principle was reached as to the steps to be taken to effect this practical contact and with the object the Soviet Government has granted a long-term credit to the amount of $5 million dollars to be repaid in kind by yearly instalments for the acquisition of the latest types of equipment of Soviet manufacture.
>
> 'It was also agreed that it would be useful to strengthen the cultural connexion between the two countries, in particular, by a more vital and direct connexion between the scientific institutes of the two countries.'

4 The eventual possibility of some such business agreement had been foreshadowed at the time of M. Litvinov's visit to Angora last October, when the Izvestiya, as reported in Mr. Strang's despatch No. 554 of the 23rd October, 1931, spoke of the time, now approaching, when the Soviet Union would be strong enough industrially to afford economic assistance to countries struggling for their national independence, and this for the first time in the world's history upon a basis of equality and not of exploitation. And though this is obviously what Ismet Pasha had in mind when he spoke to the All Union Chamber of Commerce (paragraph 12 of Mr. Strang's despatch under reference), the announcement came as a surprise. The meaning of the arrangement is not, of course, that the Soviet Government will place 5 million dollars at the full disposal of the Turkish Government because the Soviet Government certainly have not so much foreign exchange to spare. The sum in dollars is merely instituted for purposes of account. The effect of the arrangement will be I imagine that the Soviet Union will supply to Turkey, over a fairly short period, machinery &c. of Soviet manufacture of a value which both sides will agree to be 5 million dollars. In return Turkey will supply to the Soviet Union over a longer period raw materials &c. which both sides will also agree to be worth 5 million dollars, possibly with interest. The valuation of a Soviet produced motor lorry in terms of say Turkish tobacco will present a pretty problem.

5 The agreement is, however a notable one. The Soviet Government appear for the first time in the world market on any considerable scale as a supplier of machinery which may even conceivably include aircraft and arms. The Turks who want hard foreign exchange to meet their existing commitments to foreign contractors will be glad to buy further equipment in return for, say wool or tobacco or fruit of which they can presumably no more. And the Soviet Union being one big farm the arrival of the Turkish merchants will disturb no internal market and damage no local private interest, and will be of direct benefit to the community.

6 I am sending a copy of this despatch to His Majesty's Ambassador at Angora and to the Department of Overseas Trade.

I have &c.
(For the Ambassador)
WILLIAM STRANG.

Enclosure 1 in No. 43

Memorandum by Mr. Hallard

ON the 5th May the local authorities in Leningrad gave a dinner in honour of the Turkish delegation to which the heads of the foreign consular posts were invited. The President of the Leningrad Soviet, M. Kuibitski made a warm but conventional speech and Ismet Pasha replied in a speech which, with the halting translation made by a Russian Tatar sentence by sentence, took over three-quarters of an hour to deliver. No report of the speech was published in Leningrad during the following few days and it is only to-day (the 10th May) that I find a report in the Moscow 'Izvestiya'. The report follows the speech closely, except that a passage about the Red Army is omitted. The Soviet audience applauded many points in the speech very warmly, but the references to Bekov the officer commanding the Leningrad troops, and to the Red army, its past successes and its expected glorious future called forth the greatest enthusiasm. It is unusual for Red army officers to be present at functions in Leningrad to which the consular corps are invited. Possibly Bekov and some of his staff may have been invited in this instance because Ismet Pasha is a soldier and like the Red army had to fight a counter-revolutionary civil war. Similarly Ismet Pasha's feelings as a soldier and older soldiers may have moved him to make warmer statements than the parties otherwise thought it wise to set down in print. The impression I got was that the Soviet audience was taken by surprise

by the warmth of Ismet Pasha's speech. In the course of his compliments—in particular his compliments to the foreign Press—he used local patriotism they appeared to pay no attention to the phrase which the Turkish neighbours at another point. It is not to the essential point of the speech. This phrase is not in the published report. We were told clearly that Ismet Pasha said that what is done in the regard of any friendly country is good. What Ismet Pasha said was rather stronger. It was not the friendly relations existing between Soviet Russia and Nationalist Turkey only but he clearly approved what the other does in its own territory. A warning to any foreigner who permitted to take part in the affairs of Parliament by the Minister of Agriculture. Certain of the Turks have been troubled by Communist propaganda and agitators. I do not know whether this section of the Turks was the Bolshevik party or another party to power was too large or the Press too carefully watched. Ismet Pasha emphasised the need to vote only for Popular Party candidates. Turkey is a country of one party system.

Ismet Pasha had great pleasure in his position and said that he spoke what he knew well. What he said could be known to the whole world.

R. W. BULLARD.

No. 21.

Summary of Report of Speech by Ismet Pasha to the Executive Committee of the Republican People's Party on the 11th February 1932.

ISMET PASHA addressed the Executive Committee of the Republican People's Party on the 11th February 1932. He began by saying that the Party had been founded to save the people of Turkey from the disasters of war and poverty. The Party had now achieved its aim and had therefore to consider what its future duties should be.

He said that Turkey had to work out her own salvation in a difficult and stormy period of world history. Turkey's relations with her neighbours were friendly and she was not afraid of war. On the contrary, she was ready to co-operate with her neighbours in the maintenance of peace. She was determined to defend her rights and honour against any attack.

Ismet Pasha then referred to the recent visit of Soviet statesmen to Turkey. He said that the Soviet Government had always been friendly to Turkey and that the people of Turkey had always had a warm welcome in Russia. Turkey had been the first country to recognise the Soviet Government and had been the first to establish diplomatic relations with it. Other countries had followed Turkey's example. Russia had been Turkey's friend in the days of her struggle for independence and had given her help in many ways. Russia had been the first country to recognise the Angora Government as the legal Government of Turkey. Russia had been the first country to establish diplomatic relations with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of friendship with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of neutrality with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of non-aggression with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of mutual assistance with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of economic co-operation with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of cultural co-operation with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of scientific co-operation with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of technical co-operation with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of industrial co-operation with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of agricultural co-operation with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of commercial co-operation with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of financial co-operation with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of transport co-operation with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of communications co-operation with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of postal co-operation with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of telegraph co-operation with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of telephone co-operation with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of radio co-operation with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of television co-operation with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of satellite co-operation with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of space co-operation with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of nuclear co-operation with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of peaceful co-operation with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of friendship with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of alliance with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of mutual defence with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of collective security with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of disarmament with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of arms control with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of non-proliferation with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of peaceful settlement of disputes with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of conciliation with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of arbitration with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of judicial settlement with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of international law with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of human rights with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of refugees with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of asylum with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of extradition with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of mutual assistance in criminal matters with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of mutual assistance in civil matters with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of mutual assistance in administrative matters with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of mutual assistance in financial matters with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of mutual assistance in customs matters with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of mutual assistance in postal matters with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of mutual assistance in telegraph matters with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of mutual assistance in telephone matters with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of mutual assistance in radio matters with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of mutual assistance in television matters with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of mutual assistance in satellite matters with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of mutual assistance in space matters with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of mutual assistance in nuclear matters with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of mutual assistance in peaceful matters with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of mutual assistance in friendship matters with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of mutual assistance in alliance matters with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of mutual assistance in defence matters with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of mutual assistance in security matters with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of mutual assistance in disarmament matters with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of mutual assistance in arms control matters with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of mutual assistance in non-proliferation matters with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of mutual assistance in peaceful settlement of disputes matters with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of mutual assistance in conciliation matters with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of mutual assistance in arbitration matters with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of mutual assistance in judicial settlement matters with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of mutual assistance in international law matters with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of mutual assistance in human rights matters with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of mutual assistance in refugees matters with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of mutual assistance in asylum matters with Turkey. Russia had been the first country to sign a treaty of mutual assistance in extradition matters

[E 2450 449 44] No. 43.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon. (*Received May 20.*)

(No. 164.)

Sir, *Angora, May 13, 1932.*

WITH reference to my despatch No. 154 of the 28th April last reporting the departure of Ismet Pasha for Russia, I have the honour to report that he and the majority of the Turkish delegates who accompanied him returned to Constantinople on the 11th instant on the Soviet steamship "Gruzia." The remainder of the Turkish section, which includes representatives of the Ministry of National Economy, are prolonging their stay in Russia in order to have further opportunities for studying the planning of Russian methods for resale in the interest which they specialise.

2. It is evident from the effusive terms of the visit of the President of the Council to Russia, the letters of Yunus Nadi who accompanied the delegation, reveal an intense desire on the part of Russia to increase her resources and is in many respects a repetition of the exact mood and duration of Turco-Russian friendship. Yunus Nadi seems to have been greatly touched by the hospitality and courtesy of which the delegation and especially of their Soviet colleagues. Other Turkish journalists show less enthusiasm at Yunus Nadi's flowery style of the Soviet system, at the desire to foment trouble which the Russians must preclude friendship with the Western Powers, and at the Russian attempt to attract the Turkish intelligentsia by bribery.

Much will depend on the result of the negotiations for a Russian credit, which Ismet Pasha is given to understand is a condition precedent for the grant by Russia of the strategic concessions for Turkish merchants in Russia and for shipping to carry on their trade with Russia.

2. Other topics which took up much time during Ismet Pasha's stay in Russia are given in detail in the Press. He was the only member of the party who received a gold decoration. Turkish press reports of what they describe as the Turkish triumph in Russia are somewhat exaggerated, but there is no doubt that the Turkish guests were treated with the greatest consideration and hospitality. Ismet Pasha and his colleagues were interested in two cars. He was also impressed by the enormous Turkish press which is to be built to take two million tons and by the new aeroplane factory which is to be opened next year. He was also told that a suggestion that this credit should be opened immediately was possibly under consideration. Turkey was pleasantly engaged in flirting with Western Powers and the League there was still nothing like Moscow for real solid friendship. My impression is encouraged by an observation of Tevfik Rustu that it was Turkey who fixed the limit of 500 million dollars, for the Russians were prepared to give much bigger sum.

4. It is certain that the credit will ease the financial situation now faced with a large gap in the budget as it will save Turkey paying for materials which would otherwise have had to be met out of revenue and it is possible that both Russia and Turkey hope that it will avert the necessity of Turkey applying to Paris for a loan. I have even been led to suggest that the desire of Turkey to enter the League of Nations is at an end with the hope of obtaining a loan on less onerous conditions than those which France may offer. In this connexion it is possibly significant that Saraoglu Sukru Bey, who was reported to have been on the point of leaving for Paris some two or three weeks ago, has on one pretext or another put off his journey and when Ismet Pasha returned from Russia was still in Turkey, but chiefly for the purpose of learning the decisions which Ismet Pasha had arrived at on the conclusion of his Russian tour.

5. The effect of the credit remains to be seen. It is fairly clear that Turkey which is postponing payment for the war and railway material supplied to it by foreign firms, and which has recently ordered every individual in Turkey to declare the amount of foreign currency in his possession, is acutely feeling the financial pinch and may have preferred to borrow from its Soviet friend before applying to its French foe. On the other hand the operation may be but the beginning of series of agreements founded on barter which Turkey is prepared to conclude with any state that will so desire.

6. I am sending a copy of this despatch to His Majesty's Ambassador at Moscow.

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK.

[E 2657 2617/44] No. 46.

Mr. Ramsay to Sir John Simon.—(*Received May 31.*)

(No. 230.)

Sir, *Athens, May 25, 1932.*

I HAVE the honour to inform you that the Italian steamer "Teresa," bearing the Turkish Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs on their official visit to Italy, put into the Piraeus on the 23rd May for a few hours. Ismet Pasha and Tewfik Rustu Bey were met by the President of the Republic and the Minister for Foreign Affairs; the Prime Minister was unable to meet them, as he was laid up with an attack of phlebitis. Ismet Pasha and Tewfik Rustu Bey therefore called at his residence to compliment with the President of the Republic and M. Michalopoulos, where a long and friendly conversation took place.

2. I am informed on the passage of the Turkish Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs through the Piraeus that M. Eleftheron Venizelos states that, although M. Venizelos was the first to embark on a policy of drawing closer to Turkey and of friendship for that country, this policy has been unreservedly adopted by all political parties at Athens, and that the President of the Republic was about to form his Turkish visitors accordingly.

3. I have, &c., transmitted a copy of this despatch to His Majesty's Ambassador at Angora.

I have, &c.
PATRICK RAMSAY.

[E 2658 2617/44] No. 47.

Sir R. Graham to Sir John Simon. (*Received May 31.*)

(No. 109.)

Sir, *Rome, May 28, 1932.*

I HAVE the honour to report that the Turkish Prime Minister, Ismet Pasha, with his wife, the Foreign Minister, Tewfik Rustu Bey, with his wife and daughter, and a large party of Turkish Deputies and officials, arrived in Rome on the 25th May. They were met at the station by Signor Mussolini, Signor Grandi and a number of high Government officials.

2. On the morning of their arrival the Turkish Ministers laid wreaths on the tombs of the Kings of Italy in the Pantheon, on the great grave of the Unknown Soldier, and by the Equestrian Statue of the King. The Queen of Italy and Princess Mafalda lunched with their Majesties. At the same time the Chief of the Press Ministry's Press Department entertained to lunch such a party of Turkish journalists.

3. In the afternoon Ismet Pasha and Tewfik Rustu Bey were received by Signor Mussolini at the Palazzo Venezia. After an hour's interview, at which Signor Grandi was present, a protocol was signed by the four Ministers, prolonging for five years the Italo-Turkish Treaty of Neutrality, Conciliation and Regulation of Judicial Procedure of 1928 with the stipulation that, at its expiry, the treaty might be automatically renewed for a similar period.

4. On the 26th May the Turkish Ministers were entertained to luncheon by Signor Grandi, while in the evening Signor Mussolini gave a large dinner-party, at which cordial speeches were exchanged by the two Prime Ministers. The Duce expressed the desire for a further development of the policy of economic and political understanding between Italy and Turkey in the cause of peace and stability, especially in the Eastern Mediterranean, and these sentiments were re-echoed by Ismet Pasha in his reply.

5. Yesterday morning the Turkish Ministers visited the land reclamation works in the Pontine Marshes. In the afternoon they were present at the Italian Air Force display at the Littorio Aerodrome, and in the evening they attended a party at the Turkish Embassy at which I was present. I took the opportunity of conversing with Ismet Pasha and Tevfik Rustu Bey. The latter told me that

although they were delighted with the cordiality shown, the visit was purely one of courtesy and that the only concrete result had been the signature of the protocol referred to above. This was confirmed by Signor Fani, Signor Guariglia and Signor Cinigo of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs who were also present and with whom I discussed the Turkish visit. I asked Signor Chigi (who is Signor Grandi's chef de cabinet) whether the Italian Government had not been able to extract any commercial concession from the Turkish Government and he replied quite frankly that they had endeavoured to do so, but had failed. They had found the Turkish delegation extremely unforthcoming in this respect. Tevfik Rustu Bey gave me an account of the Turkish economic situation, which bore out that given in Sir G. Clerk's despatch No. 127 of the 11th April. He explained that with the greatest goodwill Turkey was not at a position to make purchases abroad.

6. The visitors return to Ankara to-morrow when the whole party is to return to Turkey.

I have &c.
R. GRAHAM

E 2711/440/44 No. 18

Sir G. Clerk (Angora) to Sir John Simon (Received May 19, 1932)

No. 179 Secret

Angora, May 19, 1932

FROM the expressions of the Prime Minister and the Minister for Foreign Affairs since their return to Moscow it is clear that they and the rest of the delegation were completely and very pleasantly impressed by their visit to Russia, and that the Soviet Government succeeded in their object of creating a favourable impression. During a two years' residence in the West one grew accustomed to the methods employed by Soviet representatives abroad. I had expected that the returned travellers would attempt to apply to Turkey the methods they seem to have discovered in Russia.

2. On the contrary, it is certainly true and probably rightly true that Russia has served as the pattern which the Turkish leaders have in mind, but they have carefully refrained from any attempt to impose it upon Turkey. They have called the Turkish leaders' attention to certain dangers and difficulties which might arise from the very different views of government and administration held in the two countries, and the Turks consider that the genuine friendship between them and the Russians will now be all the stronger because both sides know and understand the points on which they differ. In nearly every public declaration that he made in Russia Ismet Pasha laid stress on the "National" character of the Turkish State and pointed out that each country should develop on the lines that best suited its characteristics. It is true that Russia's reason why the two countries should not be sincere and loyal friends. Tevfik Rustu told me that the two Governments now understood each other so well that when Turkey joined the League of Nations it was clear to the Soviet Government that would defend her action against any voices of protest that might be raised in Moscow. (The Minister said what "not" I could not.)

3. There is, however, one outstanding result of the visit which may seem to throw doubt on its platonic character: the credit of 8 million dollars' worth of agricultural and textile machinery to be paid for in instalments of Turkish produce. From what the Prime Minister and the Minister for Foreign Affairs have said to me I have the strong impression that this was a spontaneous act on the part of the Soviet Government. The astonishing enthusiasm and admiration which Tevfik Rustu and his colleagues have reported in many despatches (e.g. No. 104 of the 13th May) that they have met with in Russia, Russian generosity, Prime Minister's gesture is partly intended to bring home to Turkey the contrast between her friendship and the unfriendly attitude of the Western Powers and the reciprocal friendship of Russia and partly a part of a calculated propaganda. "We are ready to help you and offer you credits to help a friend in need" is more or less what Russia says to Turkey, and Russia is hoping that Turkey will gratefully spend 8 million dollars' worth of machinery." Of course, by accepting the loan Turkey puts herself under a certain obligation, but while the Turkish Government is grateful for a generous and timely act it feels no doubt about its capacity to meet the obligation and will not, I am confident, change its policy out of gratitude.

4. I think too that there may have been another factor to account for the Turkish readiness to accept the advance. I found both Ismet Pasha and Tevfik Rustu tremendously impressed by the industrial development they witnessed. Probably neither of them had ever seen big industrial works before, while certainly neither of them had ever seen anything where with the object of the huge enterprises and without any thought of their profits. The sight of the machines, the gigantic cranes, the great salles of the workshops, the buildings springing up, the blocks of luxury flats in Moscow, the well-dressed and well-fed workers, the absence of beggars and tramps, all testified to the determination of the Soviet Government to push on the development of industry at this cost to the people. Every one can see that the offer of 8 million dollars' worth of machinery would be irresistible.

5. As to the first paragraph of this report, I implied that in one respect the Turkish Government might wish to apply the methods they saw in action in Russia. The tendency of this country, under the pressure of budgetary difficulties, is more and more towards the control of state enterprises by the State. In Russia, Ismet Pasha saw the control of State enterprises passed to the G.P.U. and the Russian offer of the 8 million dollars' worth of machinery had an example of its practical working. I have little doubt that the fact that a similar system is adopted by different countries of a very varied political complexion, has material calculations without any foreign aspirations, is the case at present to attract the industrial development of the country on which he has set his heart. It seems to me to be impossible to say whether the day of nationalisation or State monopolies for the assistance of private enterprise is passed or not.

6. I think I am correct in saying that neither Ismet Pasha nor Tevfik Rustu were quite prepared for the other side of the Russian shield. They evidently realised that there was much wrong and backward in the country, but they were not, I think, able to appreciate the extent to which the Soviet régime has succeeded in its efforts to adapt itself to changing circumstances, to follow the line of least resistance of its skid to grade the pressure exerted so as to slacken the tension and above all of the genius which ensures the Communist party and which will enable them to overcome successfully all the difficulties that they encounter. They feel that there is no danger of internal revolution or of the Soviet régime being upset by attack from outside for foreign aggression would unite the 150 millions Russians as never before in history and must inevitably fail. The one danger they see to this Soviet edifice is if Russia becomes involved beyond her frontiers. If the Red Army met with defeat the whole structure might collapse and the Soviet Union break up into its component parts. But they are both convinced that the Soviet authorities are fully alive to this and have no aggressive intentions whatever and they know that in spite of Soviet gibes to the contrary the danger of a foreign attack on Russia is negligible. They sum up the Soviet Russian feelings towards foreign nations with their possibilities of intervention or domination and they were impressed by seeing how Russia is making herself independent of foreign material, especially war material, by creating her own factories and in many cases by seizing factories of foreigners and turning them to national use.

7. Time alone will show if the estimate of Russia which I have ventured to attribute to the Prime Minister and the Minister for Foreign Affairs is just. I think that in many respects, and to a certain degree it is, but I also think that they over-estimate both the effect on the prosperity of industrialisation (say that the Russian Government have 45 million people now occupied in industry and that it succeeds in bringing the number to 12 million which would be the result) and the amount that still leaves 148 million persons who can make their profit. Neither Ismet nor Tevfik Rustu allow enough for the Russian character. The very characteristics of the Russian people which have made the Soviet experiment possible are those

were make them and will keep them inefficient by comparison with other peoples in the complicated technical and mechanical work which modern civilisation demands

5. I am sending a copy of this despatch to His Majesty's Ambassador at Moscow

I have &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK

E 2714 1153 44 No. 49

Secret Clerk to Sir John Simon (Received June 3)

(No. 177 Confidential)
Sir, *Angora, May 21, 1932.*

I HAVE the honour to report that the President of the Republic gave me an audience to-day for the purpose of handing to him the specially bound volumes of the official history of the Dardanelles campaign which had been presented formally by His Majesty's Government.

2. When I arrived at the Ghazi Pasha Department for the audience for this purpose the latter was face to face with a good deal of official business as well as the inevitable supervision of the result received by the Gazi, who without any parliamentary Ministers "tête de protocole" is the interpreter's son. On previous occasions when I have had the honour of speaking with the Gazi this sort of thing has grown upon me with a suspicion of the interpreter's activities in the direction of translating in French or even in German out loud the answers from Turkish in French or even in German out loud the answers from Turkish from the beginning of the interview.

3. After explaining to his Excellency that the purpose of the history was to provide the military students of history with a clear and impartial account of the campaign, executed with all the care and the attempt to free the mass of detail from its dullness, I went on to express the hope that a work of such interest to the British people would be the means of bringing together and the friendly feelings of the troops who fought so well there in the past. His Excellency was good enough to say that he would be very glad to accept the book as an expression of the sentiments which he knew I felt towards one whom they held in the highest esteem and regard for his great personal qualities. He was sure that the book would be read with interest. The President was then handed the two private letters from His Majesty the King and the Prime Minister, which he replied by saying that he would write personal letters of appreciation.

4. I then brought up Major O'Leary and the military attaché to enable the latter to be presented to the Gazi, who then opened up a table-talk conversation in connexion with his notorious during the critical days of April and August 1915. The line which Major O'Leary has taken out the Gazi's interesting reminiscences of these critical days. His Excellency then went on to talk on general topics, and seemed to be ready to continue for a long time, but after an hour I felt that I could not put any further strain on his Excellency's French and asked leave to withdraw.

5. The Gazi was suffering some pain from his teeth, but otherwise appeared to be in excellent health, and nothing could have been pleasanter or more charming than his attitude throughout the interview. He was obviously touched by the grateful thought of His Majesty's Government, and he showed a simple and genial side of his character very different from the pose of piercing eyed utterer of divine truths which he usually adopts before the Turkish people.

I have &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK

Enclosure in No. 49

The Gazi's Observations on the Gallipoli Campaign

I WAS originally commanding all the troops in the Gallipoli Peninsula, but some time before the landing of the British the southern sector was taken over by Colonel Sami Bey who was senior to me but who was quite incompetent. I was then commanding the 19th Division, and my headquarters were north of Maidos. The Corps Commander was at Gallipoli.

I kept my division occupied with training parades. One day when I was inspecting a certain unit on exercise in the direction of Long Burnu (Chunuk Bair) I climbed that hill accompanied only by my staff. Suddenly I saw a line of Turkish soldiers coming towards me from the direction of Ari Burnu. "The enemy is approaching," I said. "What enemy?" "The English," they have landed." They added that they were retiring as they had no more ammunition for their rifles. I ordered them to fix bayonets and to halt. The leading English troops not understanding what was happening did the same. Meanwhile I had rallied up the regiment, who fortunately had ball ammunition with them. This was the opening of the struggle for the Long Burnu Ridge which is the key of the whole position.

Before the August landing I constantly pointed out to the Higher Command that the English, being the finest troops, would certainly try a landing somewhere in that part of the coast, and that such attack was to be expected. They refused to appreciate my view of the Corps Commander, Esat Bey, who had been sent to this area on special post to point out to me the great danger. Nothing at Suvla was impossible. I became uneasy and repeatedly asked for reinforcements. I could not understand why I was not allowed to have them. I replied, given the same circumstances, the whole front between Suvla and Anzac would be attacked. No, I said, a wound in the thigh. I remember Saunders was sent to both places but I never doubted that I was right.

When the attack on Chunuk Bair took place I knew that I should have British troops at Suvla. However the order I answered "you must" as I said it was impossible.

The Staff Officer who came to tell me that the enemy had succeeded in capturing the heights of Long Burnu and that the seamen there told me they could not hold out any longer. "You must hold out for one day more," I said. "I will have stopped the enemy in front of Anafarta." I hurried across personally and saw the British troops in column near Suvla Bay. I had few troops here and we could not have held it if they had massed but they wasted time. I am told that General Hamilton himself came to Suvla to order an attack. Meanwhile I had ordered a counter-attack and then directed our troops to hold on while I hastened back to the other front where we were successful in turning the British off the heights again.

All through the campaign I had two battles to fight—one with the enemy, the other with the Higher Command.

Cankaya, May 21, 1932.

E 2772 2617 44 No. 50

Sir R. Graham to Sir John Simon (Received June 7)

(No. 412)
Sir, *Rome, May 30, 1932.*

WITH reference to my despatch No. 409 of the 28th instant, I have the honour to report that Ismet Pasha and Tevfik Rüstu Bey have carried out an exceedingly full programme in the course of which they visited the air display, military establishments, the International Institute of Agriculture, the Academy of Physical Education, the head quarters of the Fascist party, the Chamber and the Senate. Amongst the many functions and dinners which they attended was one given by the Soviet Ambassador to which only the Turkish Mission, Signor Grandi, Signor Giunta and various Italian officials were invited.

2. On the conclusion of the visit the following communiqué was issued to the press :—

"During the five days of their stay in Rome the Prime Minister of the Turkish Republic, Ismet Pasha, and the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Tevfik Rüstü Bey, have had on various occasions long and exhaustive conversations with the Head of the Government and the Minister for Foreign Affairs.

"These conversations, which were marked by a spirit of exceptional cordiality, and the object of which was the examination of the various international questions of the day, both economic and political, as well as those which concern more directly Italy and Turkey, have confirmed the identity of the views of the Italian and Turkish Governments in these important matters.

"The representatives of the two countries have observed with satisfaction that the policy of Turkey and Italy, based on the reciprocal friendship and understanding between the two countries, has enabled them to secure collaboration which is very useful to the general work of reconstruction and to the pacific stabilisation of the Eastern Mediterranean.

"They have, therefore, jointly agreed to continue in the same line of policy and to increase the friendly contacts between the two Governments with a view to safeguarding and developing their common interests especially in the Near East.

"The representatives of the two Governments have therefore, in particular, examined the means most suitable to stimulating as much as possible Italo-Turkish commercial relations and to establishing even closer economic and financial collaboration.

"A mixed Italo-Turkish commission will be nominated as soon as possible to give in detail practical and rapid effect to this programme."

3. It seems clear from the last paragraphs of the communiqué that a serious effort will be made to reach an Italo-Turkish economic agreement and we ought not to accept at its face value the statement of Tevfik Rüstü Bey and the Ministry for Foreign Affairs that the visit was purely one of courtesy. The press has commented with marked restraint on the communiqué, the reason probably being that the Ministry for Foreign Affairs have been kept very much in the dark and are unable to give them a lead.

I have, &c.
R. GRAHAM.

[C 4801/4801/19] No. 51.

Mr. Ramsay to Sir John Simon.—(Received June 13.)

(No. 262.)

Sir, *Athens, June 2, 1932.*

WITH reference to my despatch No. 239 of the 25th May regarding the passage through the Piræus of the Turkish Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs on their official visit to Rome, I have the honour to inform you that Ismet Pasha and Tewfik Rüstü Bey arrived in the Piræus at 10 A.M. on the 1st June on their return journey to Constantinople. They were met by the Prime Minister, the Minister for Agriculture and the Turkish Minister here. Half an hour later they were joined by M. Veniselos, who was present at the conversation which ensued between M. Papanastassiou and the Turkish Minister.

2. According to the semi-official "Messager d'Athènes," M. Papanastassiou assured the Turkish Ministers that the foreign policy of the present Greek Government would be similar to that of its predecessor, but more accentuated as regards friendship between Greece and Turkey, which remains the basis of Greek policy, and that Turkish citizens arriving in Greece could regard it as their own country in the same manner as the Greeks who have recently visited Constantinople and Angora were made to feel at home.

3. The "Messager d'Athènes" states that the Greek and Turkish Ministers agreed to bring into force at once the postal union recommended by the unofficial Balkan Conference. They agreed that other recommendations of the Balkan Conference could also be brought into effect, and decided that a mixed commission

should be formed to examine the question of an exchange of goods between Greece and Turkey. In reply to an enquiry by M. Papanastassiou, the Turkish Ministers said that they would be delighted to welcome the Greek naval school ship at Constantinople. Ismet Pasha and Tewfik Rüstü Bey reiterated their desire to see a settlement of the differences between Bulgaria and Greece as soon as possible, to which M. Papanastassiou replied that his Government were ready to help in securing this settlement and would make no difficulties.

4. After an official luncheon given by the Greek Government the Turkish Ministers continued their journey to Constantinople.

5. The Athens press reproduces this morning a telegram from Yunus Nadi Bey to his newspaper the "Jumhuriet" in Constantinople, stating that M. Veniselos has accepted the invitation of Ismet Pasha to stay as his guest for a week at Yalova in August.

6. I have transmitted a copy of this despatch to His Majesty's Ambassador at Angora, and to His Majesty's representatives at Sofia, Belgrade, Bucharest and Durazzo.

I have, &c.
PATRICK RAMSAY.

[E 2974/1153/44] No. 52.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(Received June 16.)

(No. 184.)

Sir, *Angora, May 31, 1932.*

THANKS to the article in the "Temps," reported in my despatch No. 183 of the 28th instant, the courteous and friendly action of His Majesty's Government in sending the Gazi a copy of the official history of the Dardanelles Campaign has become the occasion for an almost embarrassing display of appreciation on the part of the Turkish Government and press.

2. I have the honour to enclose a copy of a letter which has been addressed to me by the acting Minister for Foreign Affairs, which is not only remarkable for the warmth of the expressions therein employed, but because the Gazi and the Turkish Government evidently wished that the sentiments contained therein should be made known to the Turkish people. The text of the letter has been published *in extenso* in the semi-official "Hakimiyeti Milliye" of the 31st May, together with a photograph of the words of dedication, and the "Temps" article has been made the theme of a leader in the same number by Falih Rifki, of which a translation is also enclosed herein.(1)

3. I have written a suitable interim reply to Sükrü Kaya Bey, but I have no doubt that much gratification would be caused if I might receive your instructions to convey to the Turkish Government the pleasure felt by His Majesty's Government at the great appreciation of their action which has been shown in Turkey. You will also observe that the Gazi asks that his thanks may be conveyed to His Majesty the King, and I should be grateful if this fact might be submitted to the attention of His Majesty.

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK.

Enclosure in No. 52.

Turkish Acting Minister for Foreign Affairs to Sir G. Clerk.

M. l'Ambassadeur, *Ankara, le 28 mai 1932.*

APRÈS vous avoir reçu la semaine dernière, M. le Président de la République a lu attentivement la dédicace inscrite par le Gouvernement de Sa Majesté britannique sur le livre dont vous aviez bien voulu vous charger de lui faire présent au nom de votre Gouvernement.

L'hommage rendu à un grand commandant, un noble adversaire et un ami généreux par les dirigeants d'un peuple de *gentlemen* est non seulement un acte

(1) Not printed.

de courtoisie de la plus noble inspiration, mais aussi et surtout une preuve de loyauté et d'amitié à laquelle antant le Gazi que le Gouvernement de la République ont été extrêmement sensibles.

Reconnaitre justement et loyalement les qualités déployées par un adversaire dans les moments de lutte, c'est effacer les amertumes de celle-ci pour ne laisser persister que la belle leçon qui s'en dégage quant aux qualités respectives des deux nations qui ont été aux prises et qui sont décidées sur la base même de cette reconnaissance mutuelle puisée à la meilleure source.

M. le Président de la République pense que les peuples qui savent échafauder sur la compréhension et l'estime réciproques la structure de leur amitié peuvent vraiment réussir à la rendre solide, sincère et effective.

Notre grand chef me charge spécialement de prier votre Excellence de bien vouloir transmettre à Sa Majesté le Roi ses plus vifs remerciements pour la belle et délicate attention montrée par le Gouvernement royal à l'égard de sa personne et à celui du peuple turc.

En m'acquittant de cette agréable mission, je vous prie, M. l'Ambassadeur, de faire part au Gouvernement de Sa Majesté que le Gouvernement de la République voit dans son geste une nouvelle preuve de l'amitié si heureusement établie entre les deux pays.

Veuillez, &c.
S. KAYA.

E 2977/1541/44 No. 53.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(Received June 16.)

(No. 193.)
Sir, *Angora, June 3, 1932.*

I HAVE the honour to report that on the occasion of the birthday of His Majesty the King, I held the customary reception at this Embassy.

2. The Turkish Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs had not yet returned to Angora from their official visit to Italy, with the result that a number of the leading Turkish personalities who formed part of the delegation were unavoidably prevented from being present, but the reception was attended by the President of the Grand National Assembly, the Acting Prime Minister, the Acting Minister for Foreign Affairs, and most of the other Ministers, together with a large number of Turkish officials, Deputies and notables, the Diplomatic Corps and members of the British and foreign colonies. The Director of the Protocol paid a separate call to convey the congratulations of the Turkish Government, and those of the President of the Republic were sent through his secretary-general and aide-de-camp.

3. There was abundant evidence of the friendly relations now prevailing between Great Britain and Turkey, and more than one reference testified to the good impression which has been made on Turks generally by the recent presentation to Gazi Mustafa Kemal on behalf of His Majesty's Government of the "Official History of the Dardanelles Campaign."

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK.

E 2980/2617/44 No. 54.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(Received June 16.)

(No. 196.)
Sir, *Angora, June 5, 1932.*

THE Prime Minister and the Minister for Foreign Affairs returned to Angora from Rome yesterday morning, and Tevfik Rüştü Bey was good enough to see me in the afternoon in order to give me his impressions of the visit.

2. His Excellency was as expansive and open as usual, but it seemed to me that his tone was decidedly less enthusiastic than after his return from Moscow, though that may be temperamental, for Tevfik Rüştü is spiritually far more akin to the Bolshevists than to the Fascists. Tevfik Rüştü said that Ismet Pasha and

he had not gone to Italy for any other purpose than to pay a visit of courtesy which had been long promised, and to reaffirm the friendship between the two countries. The visit had no hidden aim and no specific political purpose. Indeed, the extension of the Turco-Italian Treaty of Neutrality, Conciliation and Judicial Regulation of 1928, which was the one definite political result of the visit, was more of a gesture than anything else, since that agreement has still two years to run before any question of renewal arises. His Excellency summed up by saying that Turkey had got neither more nor less than, but just as much as, she had expected, and that seemed to him an eminently satisfactory result.

3. I reminded his Excellency that Ismet Pasha had none the less come home with 300 million Italian lire, which I had the impression had not been in the original programme. Tevfik Rüştü replied that it was true that the Turkish delegation had not gone to Rome seeking a loan, but naturally the economic position had been discussed, and this advance was not a loan so much as a friendly adjustment of Turco-Italian financial relations, which the Italians had offered as an earnest of their good feelings towards Turkey. As I reported in my telegram No. 13 of the 5th instant, one-third of the money goes to pay Turkey's outstanding creditors in Italy, one-third is a credit for any subsequent purchases of Italian goods, and one-third is at the disposal of the Turkish Government to be used as it thinks fit. I gathered that such details as the rate of interest and the term for which the advance is to run have still to be settled.

4. The Prime Minister received me this afternoon and spoke in the same sense as the Minister for Foreign Affairs did yesterday, but insisted even more than Tevfik Rüştü had done upon the fact that the visit was not aimed against any other Power or group of Powers, and did not connote or foreshadow the adhesion of Turkey to any political grouping. He had been a little disturbed by the tone of the French, and especially of the Yugoslav press, for he had hoped that his perfectly sincere and open declarations would have dissipated all possibility of misunderstanding the motives of Turkey. In any case he assured me that there was nothing whatever behind the visit beyond what he and the Minister for Foreign Affairs had openly declared.

5. I see no reason to doubt the assertions of the Prime Minister and the Minister for Foreign Affairs. To conclude that Turkish policy is in any way directed against France or her allies, or to suspect that Italy, or even Russia, have succeeded in including Turkey in an association directed against any other group of European Powers, would be in contradiction to the whole foreign policy of Turkey during the last six years. Moreover, from what Tevfik Rüştü said to me I have the impression that the Turks have come back from Rome with the feeling that, while all is well with Italy so long as Signor Mussolini lasts, they do not know what may happen should he fall a victim to the ever-present assassin.

6. As for the loan, everything points to this having been an unexpectedly friendly gesture of the Italian Government, or possibly, as suggested in Sir R. Graham's telegram, No. 74, of the 4th June, of Signor Mussolini himself. No doubt Ismet Pasha and his advisers hoped during the visit to come to some more or less satisfactory arrangement about Turkey's financial commitments in Italy, and were prepared, in return for facilities for settling the demands of their immediate creditors, to undertake to make further purchases in Italy. But I should doubt whether the 300 million lire was in their programme. I am confirmed in this by the attitude of the Turkish Minister of Finance, who, when he heard of the Italian advance, said that it was not a loan, because Turkey could not and would not contract foreign loans at present, and that the 100 million lire would not be inscribed in the books of the Ministry of Finance. The Prime Minister would make such use of it for the development of the country as seemed good to him, but he, the Minister of Finance, would not take it into account when estimating the financial resources at his disposal.

7. I have sent a copy of this despatch to His Majesty's Ambassador at Rome.

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK.

[E 2983/811/44] No. 55.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(*Received June* 16.)

(No. 199.)

Sir, *Angora, June* 10, 1932.

I HAVE the honour to report, with reference to my despatch No. 99 of the 17th March last, that the Grand National Assembly passed, with some modifications, on the 4th June, the Bill for the reservation of certain professions to Turkish nationals. The following is a translation of the text of the Bill, the text of the law being not yet available :—

Article 1. Within the Republic of Turkey the professions and occupations mentioned below are reserved exclusively to Turkish nationals. The exercise of such professions and occupations is forbidden to those who are not of Turkish nationality :—

Pedlar, musician, photographer, compositor, broker, clothier, hatmaker, shoemaker, stockbroker, vendor of State monopoly products, tourist guide and interpreter, labourer in the building, iron and timber trades, permanent or temporary employee in general transport, water, heating, lighting and communication concerns, porter employed in loading or unloading on land, chauffeur and chauffeur's assistant, general labourer, watchman, doorkeeper and caretaker in flats, hotels and commercial premises, male and female servants in hotels, hans, public baths, cafés, casinos, dance-halls and bars, dancer and singer in bars, veterinary surgeon, and chemist.

Art. 2. The undermentioned professions may not be exercised without a special permit issued on the authority of the Executive Council of Ministers :—

(*a*) Aeroplane mechanic and pilot.
(*b*) Employee in enterprises connected with the State or vilayets or connected jointly with these and municipalities.

Art. 3. The exercise by foreigners of professions and occupations not reserved to Turkish nationals by this law may, in case of need, be prohibited by decision of the Executive Council of Ministers.

Art. 4. Foreigners employed in the following avocations are exempt from the provisions of this law :—

Doorkeepers of the Embassies and consulates of any foreign State and drivers of vehicles employed by it, whether they are of the nationality of that State or of other foreign nationality.

Art. 5. Foreigners exercising professions and occupations reserved to Turkish nationals on the date of the promulgation of this law are required to abandon such avocations within six months of the date of the promulgation of the law.

Art. 6. Foreigners exercising professions and occupations reserved to Turkish nationals after the expiration of the period specified in article 5 will, by order of the highest local civil official, be effectively restrained from pursuing such avocations, and, in addition, will be handed over to the court of justice with a report which will be drawn up, and will be required to pay a fine of from 10 to 500 liras.

Art. 7. The nationals of foreign States which make administrative and legal reservations in the case of Turkish nationals may be prevented by the decision of the Executive Council of Ministers from the exercise of professions and occupations which they might otherwise exercise.

Art. 8. The opening of shops by foreigners in places which are not centres of either a vilayet or a kaza is prohibited.

This law comes into force as from the date of its publication.

2. It will be seen that there is no specific provision in the law for the recognition of acquired rights of foreigners, and I propose, as soon as I am in possession of the definitive text of the law, to make enquiry at the Ministry for Foreign Affairs on this point. Liberal professions seem to be excluded from the scope of the law by the terms of article 1, but those of article 5 seem to make it possible to claim that foreigners exercising the profession of doctor and lawyer—callings already reserved by previous legislation to Turkish nationals—must cease to exercise their profession in Turkey within a fixed period.

3. The terms of article 3 make the law all-embracing, but I consider it unlikely, in view of the efforts which were made by the Ministry for Foreign Affairs during the committee stages of the Bill to restrain the nationalistic ardour of Deputies, and to keep out of the Bill material which at one time threatened to make it top-heavy and all-exclusive, that the Council of Ministers will show any inclination to abuse the powers vested in it by the terms of that article.

I have, &c.
(For the Ambassador),
JAMES MORGAN.

[E 2984/2984/44] No. 56.

Sir G. Clerk to Sir John Simon.—(*Received June* 16.)

(No. 200.)

Sir, *Constantinople, June* 9, 1932.

IN my despatch No. 183 of the 28th May last I had the honour to report on the bad impression made on the Turkish Government, the press and public opinion by the article in the "Temps" criticising the action of His Majesty's Government in presenting a copy of the history of the Dardanelles campaign to the Gazi.

2. The "Temps," in its issue of the 4th June, has now published a further article, suggesting that Italy should seek in Asia Minor the place in the sun for which she clamours, and implying that she could count on the benevolent moral support of France. This fresh article has aroused an indignation in Angora which finds its freest expression in a leading article of to-day's "République" by Yunus Nadi, proprietor and editor-in-chief of that journal. I enclose a copy of this article.(1) The semi-official "Hakimiyeti Milliye" writes in a more sober strain. It pretends to believe that the opinions of the "Temps" are not those of the French nation, and argues that the suggestion that Italy should seek expansion in Southern Anatolia is obviously intended to sow distrust between Italy and Turkey and springs from resentment at Italo-Turkish friendship, which, however, has no secret aims. The newspaper invites France to realise that both Italy and Turkey hold strongly that all Near Eastern nations should be completely independent. The friendship now existing between Great Britain and Turkey originates in the Mosul Treaty, but may be said to have its rise in England's recognition of Iraq's independence, which is the basis of the treaty. Is it wrong to hope that Syria, too, may one day be independent? Let France ask herself why she is now suspected by the whole world when, up to the outbreak of the Great War, everyone loved her, and why her own newspapers attack those sincere French patriots who are striving to bring France and Turkey together. She will find that it is because her newspapers are in the pay of munition-makers whose only aim is to set nation against nation.

3. My French colleague is in Angora at the moment of writing, and I am therefore unable to say what action he proposes to take to meet the situation. But I have no doubt that he will be able to convince the Turkish Government that such articles in the "Temps" in no way reflect the real opinion of the French Government or of serious opinion in France. None the less, it is unfortunate that ill-feeling should be unnecessarily stirred up in this way, for there are numerous outstanding questions which Comte de Chambrun still has to settle with the Turks, and his task will not be rendered any lighter by these effusions. Incidentally, harm may be caused to British interests in such Franco-British questions as the Ottoman Debt and the Constantinople Quays Company, which are among the difficult questions which France is pressing Turkey to settle.

I have, &c.
GEORGE R. CLERK.

(1) Not printed.

[E 3143/3143/44] No. 57.

Sir H. Rumbold to Sir John Simon.—(Received June 24.)

(No. 455.)

Sir, *Berlin, June 20, 1932.*

I HAVE the honour to state that, according to the press, a company entitled "Vereinigung zur Förderung des deutsch-türkischen Wirtschaftsverkehrs G.m.b.H." was formed in Berlin on the 15th June, 1932, for the purpose of promoting commerce between Germany and Turkey, particularly with a view to the exchange of goods.

2. The following firms participated in the formation of the new company: Friedrich Krupp, Vereinigte Stahlwerke, Gütehoffnungschütte, Otto Wolff, Orenstein und Koppel, A.E.G., Siemens, Julius Berger, Homère O. Fisani, of Hamburg, and Gebr. Brady, of Hamburg. The chairman of the firm is Otto Wolff.

3. It is believed that the new company will undertake the financing of industrial deliveries to Turkey by the issue of credit notes, which will be used for payments to Turkey in respect of tobacco supplied to the German firm Reemstma A.G. The difficulties arising from the direct exchange of goods will in this way be largely eliminated.

4. A copy of this despatch has been sent to the Department of Overseas Trade.

I have, &c.
HORACE RUMBOLD.

[E 3179/449/44] No. 58.

Sir E. Ovey to Sir John Simon.—(Received June 27.)

(No. 314. Confidential.)

Sir, *Moscow, June 20, 1932.*

WITH reference to Mr. Strang's despatch No. 231 of the 3rd May last regarding the visit of Ismet Pasha to Moscow and Leningrad, I have the honour to report that, according to information emanating from Mr. Berson, the representative of the Polish Telegraph Agency at Moscow, it has been learnt on the authority of the Turkish Embassy that, during the above-mentioned visit, Ismet Pasha initiated negotiations with the Soviet Government regarding the question of the Dardanelles. These negotiations are now understood to be continuing through the normal diplomatic channels.

2. Mr. Berson understood that the Soviet Government would raise no objection to Turkey joining the League of Nations so long as she—*i.e.*, Turkey—agrees to raise the question of the abolition of the international control of the Straits as soon as possible after becoming a member.

3. I report the above information for what it is worth, though confirmation is at present lacking. There would, however, appear to be nothing inherently impossible in the report, as the Soviet Government must, in the nature of things, always be to some extent preoccupied as to the safety of so important a line of communication as that passing through the Dardanelles. Moreover, it would appear that in October of last year, when M. Litvinov visited Angora, he discussed the question of the Dardanelles with the Turkish Government without, however, receiving a satisfactory reply to his request for an assurance that the latter should close the Dardanelles if Russia were at war (Angora despatch No. 361 of the 1st November, 1931). In these circumstances it would appear only natural that the Soviet Government should continue to be preoccupied with the question.

I have, &c.
ESMOND OVEY.